

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

VOLUME 33, NUMBER 4

OCTOBER 1951

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

OCTOBER 1951

VOLUME 33

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 22

NUMBER 4

CONTENTS

THE RELIGION OF BOLIVAR	<i>Jerome V. Jacobsen</i>	203
TIT FOR TAT: A NOVEL OF SOCIAL CRITICISM	<i>George L. Phillips</i>	225
VICEROY TOLEDO AND THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN MARCOS	<i>Paul S. Lietz</i>	242
BOOK REVIEWS		256
NOTES AND COMMENTS		259
INDEX FOR VOLUME XXXIII		261

MANAGING EDITOR

JEROME V. JACOBSEN, *Chicago*

EDITORIAL STAFF

WILLIAM STETSON MERRILL
J. MANUEL ESPINOSA
W. EUGENE SHIELS

RAPHAEL HAMILTON
PAUL KINIERY
PAUL S. LIETZ

Published quarterly by Loyola University (The Institute of Jesuit History) at 50 cents a copy. Annual subscription, \$2.00; in foreign countries, \$2.50. Publication and editorial offices at Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road, Chicago 26, Illinois. All communications should be addressed to the Managing Editor. Entered as second class matter, August 7, 1929, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry as second class matter at the post office at Effingham, Illinois. Printed in the United States.

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

OCTOBER 1951

VOLUME 33

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 22

NUMBER 4

The Religion of Bolívar

V. Military Dictator (continued)

To judge of the ethics and morality of Bolívar's military dictatorship from his entrance into Caracas on August 7, 1813, in the carriage drawn by the Creole girls, and his exit on a mule eleven months later, July 7, 1814, it is pertinent to check his acts against the principles of the Catholic Church to which he nominally subscribed.

First off, there is the question of Bolívar's authority or his right to take and to rule the town of Caracas. Thus far no writer has proved that he had any authority whatever to act as he did. His authority could only come from Ferdinand VII, or from the Spanish Cortes, or from Napoleon, or from the people of Caracas, or from the people of Venezuela, or from God. His right to rule certainly did not come from the first three, against whom he was in revolt. Assuredly it did not come from God. It can be stated absolutely that he was not the choice of the sovereign people of Venezuela, for the cities, towns, caudillos, Spanish and American born inhabitants were almost universally against his rule, or the rule of Caracans, while the Indians and Negroes followed their own leaders. Finally, many of the citizens of Caracas opposed his authority. His only right to rule lay in his might to rule, that is, his "army" of some eight hundred followers, conscripted from various places in and out of Venezuela. Until someone reveals the contrary, Bolívar had no right, duty, law, or authority to rule in Caracas, and therefore he was morally guilty of the ensuing injustices—the taxation, the looting, the confiscations, the trials, the executions, and all acts sanctioned by his government.

The attempted justifications of his action in this and in the many similar cases of his future career will never change the wrong

to right. It is idle to compare Bolívar's motives and procedures with those of the founding fathers of the United States. They are poles apart. There is no indication that he knew or cherished the democratic processes. Even though he talked of his government as a "republic" and erected a democratic façade, he himself characterized it as a dictatorship, and excused his action on the ground that the people were ignorant of what was good for themselves and had no experience in self-determination or self-government. The popular ignorance is perfectly understandable, but the conclusion that because of it Bolívar should determine and rule them is false, especially since he had thus far given no evidence of any genius for governing. There is no purpose to saying that he was liberating his people from the tyranny of Spain, for, as events proved, the vast majority of folk did not want to transfer the distant tyranny of Spain for the immediate tyranny of Bolívar. The pages of history abound with justifications of the actions of leaders like Bolívar who have invested capitals of nations for one or other superficial motive, but it still remains wrong to usurp the rights of another human being.

One of the first acts of Bolívar's dictatorship in Caracas was cleverly designed to make the Church appear to be sanctioning his cause. One of his young soldiers, Giradot, was killed in action and buried at Valencia.³⁵ The boy's heart, however, at the order of the Supreme Chief, was removed, embalmed, placed in an urn and brought to Caracas. Along the road the church pastors and people were required to pay homage when the carriage containing the urn paused. By the time it arrived in Caracas the carriage, with its guard of honor of soldiers and two colonels, adorned with small children dressed as angels, had all the appearance of one of the familiar religious processions for relics and the Blessed Sacrament. Moreover, all the monks, the diocesan clergy, and Archbishop Coll y Prat had to gather at a shrine-like repository for the urn at nine in the morning of October 14, 1813. All joined as the procession, with chants and music, made its triumphal way to the cathedral where the heart reposed in state. The solemn burial service began with vespers, and on the following day all attended the Mass, while the bells of the city tolled. Bolívar presided in the sanctuary beside the Archbishop!

³⁵ This Giradot episode is amply described by Lecuna in *Crónica Razonada de las Guerras de Bolívar*, I, 132-134.

Archbishops have, of course, made mistakes, but this writer cannot conceive of Coll y Prat yielding willingly to this program or missing its implications.³⁶ A Bolívar whose stock accusation was the fanaticism and superstition of the clergy here reveals some revolting character traits, aspiring even to the popes' authority of canonization, forcing reverence from all for one whom he considered a martyr, and indirectly for himself. In cheap imitation of Napoleon he sat in the sanctuary with the highest ecclesiastic of the country, thus seeking to canonize his cause, have it identified with the Church, and make of it a religious crusade. An objective observer must admit that the religious worship of Bolívar seems to have been Bolívar. Contemporaries thought the whole business sacriligious and blasphemous and completely out of the Archbishop's control, considering the announced tendency of the Supreme Chief to do away with all who opposed his will.

As has been previously stated, Bolívar's "war to the death" was highly immoral, as a violation of the natural law and the commandment: Thou shalt not kill. Some of his defenders have assumed that he was justified in waging such a war against the Spaniards since he had a right to liberty. But, despite his personal motives, he had no popular mandate and no authority to involve the land in war. Granted this principle of taking the law into one's own hands, no government can exist and chaos must result, just as was proved when other caudillos followed the principle. Some casual readers are under the impression that Bolívar proclaimed this terrible war against the Spaniards alone. This is far from the truth. It was proclaimed precisely against *all* who resisted *his* "republic (not *a* republic), whether Spaniard, Venezuelan, Creole, or slave. "Would it be right," he asks, "to suffer a war to the death and not wage one? I have declared one and I have put it into action, but not with the severity that I should have employed."³⁷ The rhetorical question can easily be answered. Bolívar started the war to the death, chose the

³⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 220-221; here Lecuna tells of the manner in which the "concord between the state and the priesthood" came about, that is, concord came with Bolívar's ordering the confiscation of the ornaments, houses, and rentals of churches, and telling the clergy what they could and could not do. For an example of Bolívar's "recommending" to the Archbishop appointments of pastors, see the dictator's letters to Coll y Prat dated February 8, and May 28, 1814, in *Cartas del Libertador*, I, 97, and 101. The latter is translated in *Selected Writings*, I, 72; in it Bolívar refused the prelate's petition for pardon of prisoners whom Bolívar had

³⁷ *Selected Writings*, I, 86.
condemned to death; they were shot.

sword as a means of forcing the colonials to organize for war purposes, and prosecuted his war, unchosen by any sovereign people. At his doorstep must be laid the blame for the ravages of war that followed. Whether he thought he was doing right or wrong is for the Supreme Judge to decide.

More immediate judgment was forthcoming. When the plainsmen, the Spaniards, and the Creoles found that they had to deal with a man who had taken their homes and properties, had executed prisoners of war, had executed civilian dissenters, had deprived Caracas of all freedom and had reached a mood of "liberating" the other cities of Venezuela, they resolved individually, severally and sovereignly to oust him. In other words, the majority of Venezuelans had branded his regime as criminal. By April, 1814, he was demanding youths for his army as soon as they reached the age of fourteen. On June 2 news of Napoleon's defeat reached Caracas. There was a sigh of relief that Ferdinand VII was again king, and an epidemic apathy for Bolívar's "republic" enveloped the city.³⁸ Unable to get men, money or moral support, he found other cities falling in line behind the terrible Boves. So Bolívar had to escape.

The manner of his exit followed a legal pattern whereby future dictators might fall gracefully from power. First he appointed a cabildo into whose hands he resigned his "authority" as Supreme Chief.³⁹ Then he petitioned the cabildo to employ him as general to defend the capital. What could the cabildo do? Once general, he decided that the place could not be held against the oncoming Boves. He would abandon it and thus save his army of 2,000. There was need of funds, therefore the cabildo ordered the churches sacked to the amount of some \$29,000 in silver, pearls and gold ornaments. This theft would presumably help the leaders to escape and reorganize for greater things. When the local "Generals," Piar and Ribas, found out that he had turned the wealth over to a pirate, Bianchi, they thought, as is customary with suspicious and narrow-minded men, that this was done to secure his own transportation and livelihood. They were ready to do with Bolívar as he had done to Miranda: turn him over to Boves, or, as some say, execute him. They allowed him to

³⁸ *Crónica Razonada*, I, 276. Lecuna has brought together an excellent blow by blow account of the movements of Bolívar, and this is the best to follow for the factual data but not for the interpretations of the facts; certainly Lecuna has everything possible in favor of the Liberator.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, I, 293.

sail, with the pirate, however, but without money or arms and with a \$29,000 debt against him.

With the legalities finished Bolívar was about to depart from Caracas. Suddenly, about half of the population wished to go with him, 20,000 men, women and children, according to the unreliable report.⁴⁰ While he took to his mule, they went on foot, because, according to his enemies, he had forced them to leave with him, or because, according to his defenders, they would rather share his lot than wait to be killed, maimed, or raped by Boves's cohort of wildmen: Negroes, Indians, slaves and royalist sympathizers. Thousands of these patriots, if we are to believe in these impossible numbers, died on the terrible journey with Bolívar to the coastal town of Cumaná, while the rest became displaced persons in the Antilles and on the Spanish Main.

This exodus is open to considerable dispute, both as to the number of people and the reasons for the disastrous trek. As a moral case it can be solved. Bolívar was definitely an occasion for their departure, since his presence and his "republic" put them in a position to be attacked with himself. He and his "army" were co-criminals, to Boves. If they willingly subscribed to his rule they were as guilty as he, unless they were misled by him. If he had willingly and knowingly hoodwinked them, the guilt is his. If he coerced them by political or military threats, he is of course to blame. If they left willingly, and certainly his own sister for one did not, he was either guilty of criminal neglect or an outright fool to expose them to the rigors of such a journey. When the disputants will have decided on the point of coercion the above analysis will serve as a means to judge the moral issue.

On the eve of his sailing from Carúpano, September 7, 1814, he addressed a farewell "Manifesto to the People of Venezuela,"⁴¹ to refute the opinion that he had been "the perpetrator of the calamities or crimes of his country." He proclaimed his innocence and held his honor untarnished, while accusing the Venezuelan compatriots of causing the calamities. "Your brothers, and not the Spaniards, have plunged the knife into your breast, spilled your blood, burned your homes, and condemned you to exile." It must indeed have been consoling to the survivors of his "republic" to know that Bolívar was not to blame and that he still thought of them. After all, they had merely undergone a civil war and were

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 1, 295.

⁴¹ *Selected Writings*, I, 80-84.

only homeless exiles. However, as a feeble pawn in the hands of Fate he vowed vengeance and vowed to strike off the chains of all who were so dumb as to refuse to be unchained. The letter is a model of dictatorial frustration. Among the incoherent and illogical paragraphs one may read this:

Far from entertaining the insane presumption of holding myself blameless for my country's catastrophe, I suffer, on the contrary, the deepest grief, for I regard myself as the accursed instrument of its frightful miseries; but I am innocent because my conscience has never been party to any wilful error or act of malice, even though, on the other hand, it may have advised me wrongly and to no effect.⁴²

The whole letter may easily be read since the Bank of Venezuela has distributed the *Selected Writings of Bolívar* rather widely, and it should be read by anyone interested in the mind and character of the Liberator. It reveals, at least to this writer, his frustration, his anger, his inarticulateness or inability to think and write clearly, his wounded pride, his vengeful spirit, his defence mechanisms, his self-pity, and, what is pertinent here, his state of conscience, or, his own idea of his guilt or innocence, the subjective side of his actions in contrast to the objective where his guilt seems apparent.

To give the kindest possible interpretation to his words, quoted above let us put them in a simple form: "I hold myself to blame. I am griefstricken. In conscience I am innocent because I did not think I was doing wrong. If I have done wrong it is because I was misguided and my conscience was ill-advised. I have acted in good faith." Now this would be a clear statement, one to which Bolívar or any man might be happy honestly to make. This is what his supporters *presume* to be the attitude of mind of the idealized patriot, the Liberator.

Unfortunately, Bolívar did not make this simple statement, as is clear from a comparison with what he actually wrote. Nor could he. The development of his character in his earlier years, his principles governing his actions as already described, and the deeds of his soon to be narrated do not admit of such a benevolent interpretation of his state of conscience. The majority of people of Venezuela at the time branded his actions as criminal, and this is why he wrote his defense and demanded to be judged not by them but by the rebel government of Bogotá, which at the moment was non-existent. Bolívar knew the moral code—he was

⁴² *Ibid.*, I, 83.

not amoral—and he confesses to having a conscience. Any man who had been a leader in so many objectively immoral activities would try long to convince a jury of his complete innocence of guilt. If what he wrote is true, he had plainly fabricated for himself a most comfortable conscience, had made his own rules of moral action just as he had fashioned laws to suit his designs. Such a conscience could never become a guide, but only an instrument for approval of an act, whether sinful or virtuous, as suitable to his ends. How *could* this type of conscience ever "be party to any willful error or act of malice"? Bolívar, like the kings of old, "could do no wrong." His remorse or grief of conscience appeared only in time of failure, when his conscience had advised him "to no effect," but in success, achieved by fair or foul means, his conscience irked him not. It caused no pain when he prosecuted his "war to the death" on civilians and troops alike, or when he executed prisoners of war, or is there indication that it pained him later when he dwelt with another's wife. In fine, what with the mind and will of a dictator developed in him already, we are unhappy to conclude that he also had come by the conscience, or lack of conscience, of a dictator. It remains merely to witness some of the operations of his own principles as they were applied until the hour of his death.

VI. "Religious Pacificator"

While the local caudillos whom Bolívar left behind to fight the cause of liberty in Venezuela were glad to be rid of him, those in Cartagena who heard of his arrival there, September 19, 1814, immediately grew concerned. He was not given a hero's welcome, as some have asserted, nor any welcome.⁴³ Nor did the chaos in the three important centers of New Granada, Cartagena, Santa Fe de Bogotá, and Santa Marta resolve itself into cosmic order. Since no one of these cities would submit to the control of the other it soon became very clear to Bolívar that none would bow to defeated Caracas or to its former Supreme Chief. Prominent among the factions striving for control in Cartagena was a group of Caraqueños who had arrived long before Bolívar. For reasons best known to themselves (and the British merchants) they sought to garner certain political and economic harvests, once

⁴³ *Crónica Razonada*, I, 349-353, has an account of Bolívar's short stay in Cartagena, and in these pages Lecuna attempts a refutation of the accusations against Bolívar.

their sway over Cartagena was complete. Bolívar was not wanted by them, his compatriots, as is attested by their accusations against him of theft and ineptitude. The royalists and conservatives of Santa Marta certainly were offering him no hospitality. In short, so hostile were all factions along the coast, including stout General Castillo, that the man without a friend had very soon to leave that area to go up south into the highlands.

On October 27, 1814, he received some news which his astute mind hailed as an opportunity to regain face and possibly fortune. One of his leaders, General Urdañeta, had made a "brilliant retreat" from western Venezuela with what Bolívar called the "army of Caracas," a nondescript force of about a thousand men, and had arrived at Tunja. Bolívar hastened there and shortly took command. He decided to "liberate" Bogotá and its province, Cundinamarca, and thus have the capital of the Viceroyalty of New Granada, which was practically defenceless. In a month's time his "genius" for organizing "campaigns" had the "army" on the move, without much thought for clothing, food, muskets, powder, etc. These were to be gathered on the way. Armed with swords and perchance *machetes* the huge band arrived in the outskirts of Bogotá on December 8, the great Catholic holy day in Latin America, when such unholy things as war should not be thought of. Bolívar sent three letters to two unsuspecting citizens. They were ultimatums—two polite and one nasty.

In the first letter the President of Cundinamarca was informed that Bolívar had been ordered by the general government of New Granada to unite this province with the others.⁴⁴ This was a lie. There was no general government nor any such order. Next, Bolívar stated that he wished to bring about the union without firing a shot. After all, his argument runs, we are all brothers "professing the same sublime religion of Jesus," and we should not be killing each other. In other words, we Catholics should not be killing each other; we should be killing only those other Catholics who do not agree with me, Bolívar. The rest of the letter is a series of threats of outrages to be perpetrated on Bogotá if it does not yield to "the heroes of Venezuela, triumphant in hundreds of battles," who know not defeat. The President chose to ignore the bandit bluster.

The second letter⁴⁵ went to Juan Jurado, the only one in the

⁴⁴ *Selected Writings*, I, 84-85.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 86-88; *Cartas del Libertador*, I, 107-110.

whole city whom he could call a friend, Bolívar said. Bolívar urged Citizen Jurado not to be taken in by the lies and calumnies regarding his conduct. He had *not* put to death prisoners, except several who were traitors and four hundred Spaniards. He did *not* wage a war to the death, nor does he intend to wage one against Bogotá, that is, if it surrenders peacefully. Otherwise, all the horrors of war will be visited upon it. With bland mendacity he described the powerful force under his command, the other armies from Venezuela and Cartagena which he could summon, and his own undefeated, invincible troops "which are comparable to and even superior to the best of Napoleon's." All of which twaddle left Citizen Juan unimpressed, for he returned a reply that infuriated Bolívar. Bolívar then hastened the following sample of his dictator thinking to private Citizen Jurado:

I have received your reply with the greatest grief, for I see by it that you persist in dying at the hands of our soldiers, who have orders to assault the city and not to spare for a treacherous attack a single inhabitant who might assassinate them treacherously [by sniping] from the streets, the houses and windows, since as I have been informed, even the clerics and women are armed with missiles to destroy us. Santa Fe is going to present a vast spectacle of desolation and death: the houses will be reduced to cinders if by them we are angered. Two thousand flaming torches will be carried to reduce to embers a city which wants to be the sepulchre of its liberators and which receives with jeers, the most outrageous [jeers], one who comes from such remote lands to break the chains that its enemies wish to place on it. These cowards, like so many fanatics, call me irreligious [Godless] and name me Nero; I will be then their Nero, now that they force me against the most vehement sentiments of my heart, which loves all men because they are its brothers, and the Americans because they are its companions in origin and misfortune. My soul is torn to shreds by the mere contemplation of the dread to see reduced to nothing a city, the sister of Caracas and mother of some of the liberators of Venezuela. In short, I send my last intimation: if it is accepted, I am the best friend of this land: if they refuse it, wretched accomplices! these accomplices are the authors of a crime so horrifying as the destruction of this fair city and the death of its sons. You can change this decree, and if you do not you are the second victim after the president. Adios, until you see me as your liberator or your judge.

Simón Bolívar.⁴⁶

The swordfighting began in the streets of Santa Fe de Bogotá on December 9, and the defenders of their homes, colonials and Spaniards alike, finally yielded on December 12.

⁴⁶ *Cartas del Libertador*, I, 110-111. This letter dated December 9, 1814, is not translated in *Selected Writings*, though it certainly should have been included as a fine example of Bolivarian mentality.

What was the morality of this action? Bolívar was an aggressor, "from remote lands," without the semblance of authority, slaying people who had done him no wrong, and must be held responsible for highly unjust and a immoral act and for the many particular consequences in losses of life and property. He had no mandate from "Fate" or "Destiny" or civilization or any responsible group or majority to invade the homeland of other people or to force them to enjoy such freedom as his dictatorship promised. Any priest hearing his confession would certainly bind him to complete restitution for the violations of the commandments before absolving him from his sins. Apparently Bolívar stayed away from the confessional.

Now that he had "united" Bogotá and Cundinamarca to the other provinces, he set about uniting the other provinces to Cundinamarca. Within a week he had appointed members of his government, which in turn appointed him general of the armies. By means of this façade of authority he forced all civil and military authorities and corporations to take an oath of allegiance to his government, he searched houses, and forced all to pay taxes for the support of his soldiers.⁴⁷ Then he graciously and "humbly" accepted from the Electoral College of his own selection what he considered his "greatest reward," the title: *Ilustre y Religioso Pacificador de Cundinamarca*, which has been translated "Illustrious and Hallowed Pacificator of Cundinamarca."⁴⁸ Thus, with a capital, and a government, he was ready to pacify such places as Cartagena and Santa Marta, where the cult of Bolívar obviously needed spreading.

General Castillo, in charge of something or other at Cartagena, took time from his war against Santa Marta to term Bolívar's "war" on Bogotá one of "plunder, irreligion, immorality, and despotism," and to characterize Bolívar's followers as "Venezuelan cannibals."⁴⁹ Bolívar wrote an angry refutation of this defamation of his character, which had no effect at the time but seems to be taken seriously by some recent writers. When one of Bolívar's officers at Honda executed sixteen "disaffected" Spaniards, the general im-

⁴⁷ See his report of December 19 from The General Headquarters of the Liberator to Citizen Secretary of the Department of War, in *Cartas del Libertador*, I, 111-112.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, I, 120, and *Selected Writings*, I, 91.

⁴⁹ *Crónica Razonada*, I, 363-368; Lecuna here attempts to refute what he calls these absurd criticisms and libels, and on page 370 he attempts to show how Gual and Castillo were all wrong, though, we observe, they were both far better in principles than Bolívar.

pression of his rule was so bad that he ordered a trial of the officer, forgetting that the fellow was merely applying his chief's principles.⁵⁰ Bolívar must be held responsible *in causa* for any such deeds of his men or governments.

The "Religious Pacificator" marched north with his army of two thousand generals, colonels, Hussars, fusilliers, bowmen, dragoons, swordsmen and cavalry, having the general intention of taking Cartagena Santa Marta, or Caracas. By May, 1815, he was in a predicament. Bogotá was full of enemies; other towns and villages had turned against his republic, against domination by Venezuelans, against the foraging troops; more than eight hundred of his men had deserted.⁵¹ It would be impossible for him to take revolutionary, well fortified Cartagena or conservative Santa Marta. No locality desired liberation, as it meant a central authority opposed to their wishes of a loose federation of states. Moreover, the Spanish troops had arrived and were occupying Barranquilla.

Under these circumstances his letter of resignation on May 8, 1815, is rather amusing.⁵² "Love of public peace and the country have made me resign command of the army," he says, and goes on to explain how enemies surround him. To save the army for other uses "I determined to make the last sacrifice which was possible for me, I determined to separate myself from my friends and companions in arms." In other words, he wished to get away alone. "Every soldier, I say it with a blush, every soldier preferred to a man to share my fate; but my one object was to preserve the army intact." When we consider that in the forty days march over eight hundred of these staunch followers had deserted him, it seems reasonably clear that those whom he was about to leave in the highlands also had ideas of escaping from the wrath to come. "The sacrifice of the command, of my fortune and of my future glory has cost me no effort. For me it is so natural to prefer the security of the republic. . . ." He protests that his intentions were good. So saying he journeyed on a British warship to Kingston, Jamaica, where he was on May 14, 1815, safe ashore under the British flag.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, I, 372; it is not stated what penalty Bolívar meted out to the executing officer; Bolívar was in a dilemma; he could not logically execute the man, and if he did not, he tacitly approved of the crime.

⁵¹ See Bolívar's letters of March 19, and March 24, 1815, in *Cartas del Libertador*, I, 140 and 141, and *Crónica Razonada*, I, 371-378.

⁵² In *Cartas del Libertador*, I, 141-143, and *Selected Writings*, I, 93-95.

VII. Spoil's System

Within five days after his arrival Bolívar turned to the British for aid. His first of a long series of letters went to one Maxwell Hyslop, merchant of Jamaica. Following Miranda's plan he laid before the trader a picture of the whole Caribbean area as "the center of commerce of the universe." To make it such, he said, British aid was needed. A month later to the same Hyslop Bolívar stated his purpose in life. "I desire to continue serving my country, for the general good of mankind and the increase of British commerce."⁵³ Since the status of his "country" was about as vague as the "general good of mankind" to the practical minds of the British merchants, who had long regaled themselves in this traders' paradise and because of the civil strife were losing money in Venezuela, Bolívar's promise of allegiance to British trade had little effect. He had no products to offer, no prestige, and it is small wonder that he thought of the Orinoco mission lands and their products as a source of income and possibly as a bait to British adventurers.

It is not to the purpose of this paper to trace his various activities in the islands and in eastern Venezuela during the next three years. There appears no thought of religion in his dealings with merchants, smugglers, pirates, Petion of Haiti, the Dutch islanders and the British diplomats. Whether his purpose was to liberate the people of Venezuela for his own selfish reasons or for patriotic reasons is conjecturable, but it is certain that he was willing to adopt any means, good or bad, to attain his end, and thus by consorting with sundry scamps, adventurers, mercenaries, and deluded persons he prepared for more bloodshed and ravage in Venezuela.

From May 14, 1815, to March 31, 1816, Bolívar busied himself tirelessly trying to get loans, volunteers, munitions and ships for an attack on Venezuela. On February 7, 1816, he had himself elected Supreme Chief of the expedition, though a few French pirates and Venezuelan caudillos did not approve.⁵⁴ His success as inspirer of men in the cause of liberty may be judged by the numbers inspired. He collected about 240 men, of whom about 160 were officers and officials, six schooners (all captained and manned

⁵³ *Cartas del Libertador*, Tomo XI, New York, 1948, 36.

⁵⁴ *Crónica Razonda*, I, 422.

by foreigners), and a dozen assorted cannon,⁵⁵ The most impressive item in the whole affair was the title taken by its leader: "SIMON BOLIVAR, Supreme Chief of the Republic, and Captain General of the Armies of Venezuela and of New Granada, &., &., &." As long as historians are impressed by this sort of lexiphanic nonsense, we may expect celebrations in honor of Bolívar.

This little filibustering expedition got under way from Los Cayos in westernmost Haiti at the end of March, 1816.⁵⁶ It captured two ships carrying cargos worth eating, and a pair of friars. The latter were traded ashore for two cows. Of course the Supreme Chief captured the undefended little town of Carúpano without firing a shot. By July he was able to swell his armies from 250 to 800 men, but the "liberation" of some slaves may have played some part in the augment. Hearing of the approach of fourteen Spanish ships he decided to preserve his strength and valor for the future. On July 17, 1816, he took to his schooners and after various unwelcomed stops put in once more at Los Cayos on September 3.

For the next three months he was defending his failure and preparing another quixotic expedition.⁵⁷ This was as badly managed as the preceding and was composed of as motley a personnel. The first ship, leaving Cayos on December 9, was soon captured by the Spaniards. Bolívar left Jacmel, Haiti, on December 21 and arrived at the small town of Juan Griego on the Island of Margarita on December 28. Declaring the island a republic, he addressed himself to the various guerrilla chiefs, summoning them to fight tyranny and promising them the conquest of all lands to Peru.

These chiefs headed independent bands similar in character to a Pancho Villa, who supported themselves by pillage in the name of liberty. There were perhaps a dozen such in Venezuela, but the four most important were Páez in the west, the half-breed Piar in the southeast, and Bermúdez and Marino in the eastern area. These Bolívar addressed as "beloved companions and friends" and "Generals." The ridiculous inflation extended to his 700 man army and to his five ship navy and to his government officials. Indians became "bowmen," cowhands became "cavalry," raids became "cam-

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 434.

⁵⁶ Lecuna has made this trip enormously important by using pages 401 to 483 in his *Crónica Razonada* to describe it in detail; all events are made to revolve around Bolívar, whereas to the British and Spaniards his was just one more raid.

⁵⁷ *Crónica Razonada*, I, 495-536.

gains," &., &., &. After some "brilliant victories" Bolívar moved his "General Headquarters" to a church in Barcelona on the mainland. From this "fort" Bolívar thought that he was directing affairs from January to March, 1817, when he was forced to admit that there was "anarchy in the army." Each of the outstanding "generals" was running his own "government."⁵⁸

In March the Spanish troops were still inactive owing to fevers, and so was Bolívar. There was no money for the soldiers, nor much opportunity to gain a livelihood by the customary looting, since the sparsely settled country was by this time devoid of products. To the south, however, in Venezuelan Guiana lay the twenty-nine mission towns between the Caroní and Orinoco Rivers, four hundred square leagues of farm and grazing lands, directed by the Capuchin friars. This was the one garden spot of Venezuela, where peace had reigned for a century and plenty was the rule. Here the missionaries had labored to fine effect with their Christian Indians. To this fertile land Bolívar turned his eyes, then his steps. It became the setting for a great crime.

He reached the mission lands to meet "General" Piar on April 3, 1817. From January to March, Piar had been taking mission after mission, putting a "military commander" as head of each. By the time Bolívar arrived he had taken over the southern part of the chain of missions and he and his men had the horses, mules, cattle, and other properties. What agreement was made between the two leaders is not certain, but certain it is that Bolívar did not condemn the thefts, that he did consider Piar as a subordinate "General" and that after a month he made Piar a "General-in-Chief." After the talk the Supreme Chief went back to Barcelona to evacuate the place officially and to plan ways of eliminating the rival chiefs, before the arrival of the Spanish General Morillo and 10,500 soldiers. He got back to the Orinoco and was at Angostura on April 30, 1817.

He promptly set up his republic, &., &., &., and confirmed all the titles of Piar. This worthy when confiscating the missions imprisoned all forty-one of the friars who were caring for the Indians.⁵⁹ He had them in jail for three months, even when consulting with Bolívar. During this time fourteen had died of the effects of their imprisonment and seven had escaped. Twenty re-

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 537-539.

⁵⁹ The tragedy in the Guayana missions is told in many places. Lecuna, *Crónica Razonada*, II, 25-33, presents a resumé of the reasons why Bolívar could not be to blame.

mained in jail at Carhuachi for a month while Bolívar was Supreme Chief of the area. Bolívar wanted them in a place where they could not influence the Indians or aid the royalists. He ordered their removal to another jail. The two officials in charge suddenly had all twenty friars lined up and shot.

Since that crime there has been an exceptional amount of argument over the author of the foul deed. The main question has been: "Who gave the order for the assassination?" All sorts of answers, excuses, extenuations, have been forthcoming, but none of them are to the point. From the viewpoint of law, the due process of law, the question is: "*By whose authority* were these men arrested, imprisoned, unaccused and untried, and kept in jail in jeopardy to their lives?" The answer is positive: By the authority of Piar and Bolívar; therefore, the two were guilty of what Lecuna, Bolívar's staunchest defender, termed one of the most lamentable deeds of the revolution.

Piar made the arrests on his own authority, and possibly with the express or tacit consent of Bolívar. For, Piar was recognized in January as one of Bolívar's "generals" and Bolívar knew of his operations in the Guayana missions. Bolívar considered Piar's act expedient; he did not instigate any trial or cause Piar to conduct one. Fourteen unjustly imprisoned men died in three months as a result of the jail conditions. Certainly Piar was directly responsible for this, and Bolívar shared the responsibility, insofar as he was in command over Piar. Then, Bolívar, *after* these deaths and *aware* of Piar's thefts in the missions, raised Piar's rank, thus indicating that he had authority over Piar and that he approved. Now, in May, Bolívar by his own authority kept the remaining twenty priests and brothers in jail without trial and gave full evidence of his responsibility over them by ordering their removal to another prison. How and why a couple of ex-cowherds shot these men in cold blood can be debated forever, but the fact is that they were the appointed and approved officers of Piar and Bolívar. Consequently, since neither Piar nor Bolívar had any mandate from the people or from any government to take lands, to arrest, to imprison, to try, to execute, and since they so acted on their own initiative, they must be held guilty of violation of justice in all these respects.

Bolívar was by now quite hardened in the ways of a dictator. The time had come for him to force other caudillos into line or liquidate them. Piar was particularly in the way, refusing to yield

control of some of the missions, from whose produce Bolívar wished to finance his war. On July 26, 1817, Piar had parted with Bolívar and had established the headquarters for his raids at Upata. Bolívar remained at Angostura, where he was safest from Spanish attack and where he could control downriver traffic. The two had thus squared off, two bandits to the people of the region, snarling over the mission spoils.

Piar, in criticism of Bolívar government, asked for more democracy. Coming from him this could mean that he wanted a more equitable distribution of the spoils. He was a mulatto from Caracas and like the run of the mine caudillos abounding in Latin America of the time opposed centralization. Since the Indians of the missions had scattered to the woods to escape his and Bolívar's supervisors, he started his war on the whites, which can be interpreted to mean that he began taking properties from settlers from whom Bolívar hoped to get "revenues." On September 17, 1817, Bolívar ordered his arrest. This was made ten days later and he was brought to Angostura for trial. Bolívar appointed the judge and jurymen, who found Piar triable by a military council. Bolívar appointed his men to the council, which, of course, condemned Piar to death on October 15 and had him shot the following day.

Bolívar hastened to justify his act with a proclamation. This, besides being a warning to any who "aspired to the supreme command," as Bolívar said Piar had done, was blasphemous. The last part runs:

Heaven has seen with horror this cruel parricide. Heaven delivered him to the vengeance of the laws. Heaven has permitted that a man who offended the divinity and the human race should no longer profane the earth, which could not tolerate him for a moment after his heinous crime.

Soldiers! Heaven watches over your safety, and the Government which is your father alone, is ever awake for you. Your chief, who is your companion in arms, and who always at your head has shared your dangers and miseries, as well as your triumphs, has confidence in you. Be confident then in him, secure in that he loves you more than if he were your father, or your son.⁶⁰

Here is your Bolívar on the eve of his rise to fame. He pronounced a judgment upon Piar for reasons which applied equally to himself. He identified himself with heaven and with the divinity. He considered himself justice itself. He, his government, the laws, the constitution, heaven, were all one to his perverted

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, II, 88-89.

mind. At thirty-four his character was hardened in the dictator mold. Unfortunately, the mold was not broken and thrown away before his methods became the stock in trade of a thousand less conspicuous and less publicized imitators who have with his principles of action made shambles of cities and countries in Latin America through a long century. His slogan, eliminate or be eliminated, offered no opportunity for growth, but fastened on the helpless people a one party, one man, bayonet and bullet rule. This was Bolívar's religion—himself.

No redeeming feature appears in his character, no Catholic, no Christian principles in his personal or public life. His vanity, pride, anger, intolerance, and sexual aberrations became bywords. There is little evidence of any civic virtues, except some isolated statements and twaddle about education, liberty, and constitutional guarantees which he doled out on occasion for public consumption but upon which he rarely acted. Appointments to offices were made according to one ability, the ability to obey Bolívar. Public affairs were managed by whim. The public treasury became Bolívar's wallet, the courts became vindicators of his whims, the constitutions became elastic instruments of maladministration. As evidence of his crookedness, ineptness and criminality was added in his progress through Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia, it is little wonder that his name was held in an opprobrium and hatred which continued for half a century after his death and even to the present in the minds of descendants of those whom he "liberated" or otherwise persecuted for his own gain and glory.

Several important steps had to be taken before Bolívar could reach such fame that no man would dare rise in criticism. To consolidate his position at Angostura, to control Páez in the west, to keep a commercial and munitions supply line open from the sea up the Orinoco, and above all to enlist the aid of Britain and the foreign legion. When he captured Angostura in July, 1817, he evacuated its population of eighteen hundred, including the clergy and bishop-elect.⁶¹ The move solved a housing problem for his troops and exiles from Caracas, who were freed from rent. He instituted a system of forced labor. Desertions from his army were a constant problem. Royalist property was distributed by a

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, II, 50-97. Lecuna in his very good work of putting together the details of the deeds of Bolívar at Angostura, naively assumes that Bolívar had authority on his side, although admitting that there was chaos in the army, that the chiefs whom he supposed to be under him were operating as individuals, and that the landowners did not subscribe to his rule.

tribunal of sequesters. By October this board was in a position to allot rewards to the servants of the republic from the sale of mission produce, from confiscated properties, and from spoils from ships (including two from the United States) taken by sea raiders. By his decree of October 10 the generals, chiefs, officials and soldiers each received a share according to rank from 25,000 pesos down to 500. The government, that is, Bolívar, reserved the right to grant bonuses without reference to rank for heroic services. What bonus was given to the chief hero by his three appointees is not clear. All exports and imports were in the hands of the government. In November, to show his authority over churchmen, he ordered the few remaining to meet to elect an ecclesiastic authorized to administer affairs in the place of the evicted bishop-elect.

By April of 1818 Bolívar had received another lesson in how not to conduct a campaign. The disastrous foray began after Bolívar had occupied Calabozo. Just beyond this town in the "Corner of the Bulls" a force of 3,000 Spanish troops completely routed the 1,900 insurgents. We need not delay on the rather ignominious part played by Bolívar in missing the battle, losing his horse and some of his regalia, and escaping on a sergeant's pony.⁶² He got back to Angostura on June 5, 1818, with about two hundred followers. His defeat has been explained in various ways as owing to traitors, deserters, Páez's inefficiency, et cetera, but it remains as a monument of inept military leadership on Bolívar's part, who paid no attention to training, organization, equipment, munitions, support columns, and other items of warfare. Here the story of Bolívar might have ended if the foreign legionaries especially from Great Britain had not arrived to bring what he lacked in supplies and generalship.

VIII. Repudiation

Popular support and the semblance of authority for the revolt against Spain was growing in the colonies after the return of the absolutism of Ferdinand VII in 1815. Feelings against the crown had taken deep root around the Americans except in caudillo-ridden Venezuela, where even the absolutism of Spain seemed a lesser evil than the chaotic conditions engendered by the rival bands of insurgents. After the revolt in Spain in 1820 ushered in

⁶² *Ibid.*, II, 194-196.

the radicals, the support of the people of the Americas for the revolutionary Creole leaders grew swiftly, and hence lent more and more authority to the cause of emancipation. Moreover, beyond the political and economic aspects of the revolt against the iconoclastic Spanish Cortes, the Creole and Spanish Catholics not yet won over to the idea of emancipation fell into line with the revolutionaries. This explanation of the possible authority of Bolívar for his successful revolt, does not mean that he is any way suffered a change in his dictator character, or that he became a genius of organization, or leadership, or political science. He did, however, with the aid of amanuenses and other followers, exploit his flare for publicity.

Bolívar's official relations with the Holy See and his official relations with the prelates and clergy of the area now broken into the republics of Venezuela, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Panama, and Bolivia have been given ample notice by Pedro Leturia, Mary Waters and other writers easily found in Bolívar bibliographies. Coming from Bolívar and as official documents his writings on Church and State affairs are a key to what he was thinking at the moment. From 1821 when Bolívar's government enacted the wedge law suppressing all convents housing more than eight religious, the constitutional trend was to paralyze the churchmen, and his Neroism has continued to the present. Just after his victories at Boyacá and Carabobo, some eighty of the clergy had been exiled, an equal number had been executed or mistreated to death, and about forty remained in the new state, some willingly and others perforce. The Supreme Chief from time to time requested appointments for priests who subscribed to his dictatorship and were to him good priests. In 1824 the Congress passed a law declaring that the right to nominate candidates for vacant bishoprics was vested in the government, that is, Bolívar. This attempt to control the Church by controlling its manpower, one of a hundred made by upstart dictators, instigated kindred enactments all over the Americas where the privileges of the old Patronato Real were coveted as approval of this or that dictator's program.

The rising power of Santander and the anti-Clericals in Bogotá caused Bolívar to turn everywhere, even to bishops and priests, for support from 1825 to his downfall in 1830. Under threatening circumstances when his "glory" and his life were endangered, he called in pious phrases for a reform in morals, for religious instruction and sermons (especially such as might prevent attempts on

his life and power), and he spoke to priests and bishops as a child of the Church. A good example of his dictatorial docility is his letter ⁶³ to Pope Leo XII, of November 7, 1828, when, after years of iron rule over churchmen, he found tottering the edifice which he was attempting to erect upon such flimsy principles as his untrained mind devised. In the letter he expressed in honeyed words his worry for the souls of the flock of Christ because of the scarcity of priests to minister to the spiritual needs. In this whimsy the Libertador Presidente forgot, of course, the part he had played in reducing priests, their ministries, and religious ideals to a minimum.

The wordy, Bolivarian edifice crumpled completely when the rival chiefs mastered his principles of conduct, sent him on his way, and proceeded to atomize central jurisdiction. It has long been the custom of professors, including this writer, to narrate to their classes the story of Bolívar's broken republic and the ingratitude of the Latin American people toward their emancipators. Why did none of the liberators win the hearts of his people? Why were liberators exiled or done to death? Now, from a character study of Bolívar in its religious aspects, the story must change and the answers to the question of ingratitude is a denial of time-honored suppositions. There was no republic, no democratic form of government, no tendency on Bolívar's part to trust the people. In his dictatorship and principles the people apparently saw what they did not want. It might even be argued that they revealed, instead of a lack of training in democracy as we have been telling classes, a high sense of democracy, since they did not want caudilloism, militarism or dictatorship and since they suffered no end for adhering to fundamental principles of democracy as expressed in our Bill of Rights. The inarticulate masses, not the Bolívars nor the military oligarchs, originated and have perpetuated the ideal of human rights. Hopefully, generation after generation, the people have flocked to the banners of leaders who gave promise of overthrowing dictatorship. Finally, the supposition that Bolívar liberated the people is true only to the extent that they were freed from Spain; otherwise their liberties were curtailed rather than enlarged, and particularly their deep-rooted religious liberties.

Concrete instances of his lack of stability and leadership abounded. Living openly with his mistress, Manuela, Bolívar offended public taste. In a stupid move to keep favor he insisted upon the attendance of clergymen when invited to his house. The Freema-

⁶³ *Cartas del Libertador*, VIII, 105-106.

sons and anti-Clericals, led by Santander, scoffed at his hypocrisy and duplicity. Bolívar accused his "calumniators" of misuse of public funds, only to have the charge hurled back at himself. Colombia was bankrupt and had a large foreign debt. Peru, on the warpath against Bolivia, threatened to attack Colombia. Elsewhere his appointed "generals" were holding the reins in various cities. Separatism was in the air; looting, brigandage, and disorders were of daily occurrence; the "navy" revolted. In February, 1828, Bolívar appointed a court with special powers to try traitors, that is, any political opponent of his. So in danger was his life in Bogotá that he left on March 14, 1828, for Tunja, then Bucaramanga, while a general assembly of delegates at Ocaña tore apart his constitution in favor of the counter-proposal of Santander. Some radicals proposed the impeachment and execution of Bolívar. It was ever thus through the years; his name became a symbol of strife.

Amid such hazards it is not surprising to find him writing on June 6, "Yes, my friend, I have converted myself to the way of heaven: I am repenting myself of my worldly conduct, tired of imitating Alexander. . . ." ⁶⁴ It is said that he even lapsed into the practice of attending church services. Yet, when his men at arms again took control in Bogotá, he returned there in triumph. His courage restored by the presence of his loyal guns, he issued decrees making himself supreme dictator. By September 25 conspirators had arranged Bolívar's death trap. Because of Manuela's sleeplessness and, according to her own later account, her quick wit in telling him to jump out the window, he escaped. Un-nerved (or, as his worshippers say, sick in body and at heart over this ingratitude) he promptly resigned his presidency, but his followers forced him to stay, expressing their gratitude by executing all suspected of being party to the plot. Bolívar was enraged when his court thought it inexpedient to execute Santander.

Now that "Admiral" Padilla was executed, other caudillos were to be whipped into line. "General" Córdoba got himself murdered in an attempted revolt, some say by the orders of Bolívar, though his friend General Urdaneta denies the charge. Santander was exiled. However, this type of "gang" warfare could not long be carried on by Bolívar, when we consider the bad state of his health. The "usurper," as he was termed, finally retired from Bogotá on March 1, 1830. Thinking the assembly would summon him again

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, VII, 321.

to the presidency he was rudely shocked when a committee visited him on a farm outside the capital to inform him that he was not wanted as president or as resident of Colombia. The deputies voted him a pension for life abroad. He left Bogotá in May amid no public grief. Public opprobrium met him on the coast at Cartagena. He found his last bed in the home of a Spaniard near Santa Marta.

When the Bishop of Santa Marta, aware of Bolívar's mortal illness, visited him, the dying man, so the story goes, waved him away, but when he became certain that his death would be soon, he received the last Sacraments of the Church, December 10, 1830. His last will and testament, signed the same day, has given joy to some Catholic writers who see in it a profound profession of faith in the doctrines of the Catholic Church. However, we see no cause for regarding the introductory paragraph, composed according to form by a lawyer, as expressive of Bolívar's lifelong attitude toward religion. In fact, the pious sentences in which he professes "belief in the Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church, in whose faith and belief I have lived and profess I shall live until I die, as a true Catholic and Christian," could hardly have been composed or subscribed to by the fever-racked man. Still, in these hours before death, it were best to grant him the right to be considered as having been sincerely repentent, and leave to his Creator the judgment of his deeds and intentions.

In summary, the Bolívar of scores of his glorifiers, is a fictitious character, built around and to the proportions of a great event in American history—the emancipation from Spain. In reality he was a disliked, mistrusted and emotionally adolescent individual. He was no true Catholic, no true Mason, no Deist, no democrat, no statesman, no scholar, no humanitarian, no military genius. He followed no pattern of life characteristic of great men, but lived by the hour for himself, acting upon a self-fabricated set of flexible standards and rules. Objectively, he was in name Catholic, for he was baptized, was married, died and was buried according to the rites of the Church, but beyond this, he left very little evidence of any practical devotion to its dogmas or commandments and very much evidence of practices contrary to its precepts, teachings and counsels.

JEROME V. JACOBSEN

Loyola University, Chicago.

Tit for Tat: A Novel of Social Criticism

I. The Novel

The first humanitarian novel on either side of the Atlantic to champion the cause of the miserable climbing-boys of England, *Tit for Tat: or, American Fixings of English Humanity. By a Lady from New Orleans, U. S.*, (1854), has been unjustly slighted, even misrepresented, by our literary historians and variously catalogued under "Anonymous," "Julia," "Matthew Estes," and "Marion Southwood" by our librarians.¹ Although the work passed through at least two English editions and four American,² it rests undisturbed on the shelves of a few libraries now that the social reform for which it battled has long since been achieved. Yet, as the *Uncle Tom's Cabin* of the under-privileged living brushes of English flues, this American novel deserves more respect and attention than it has as yet received.

Tit for Tat has been erroneously described as a pro-slavery novel, a mistake arising naturally enough by the binders' title on American editions, *Tit for Tat. A Reply to Dred*. In his engaging study, *The Southern Plantation*, Francis Pendleton Gaines listed it

¹ The Harvard College Library uses "Anonymous"; the British Museum, "Julia," the signature in the dedication of the English editions; the Library of Congress, "Matthew Estes"; the New York Public Library, "Marion Southwood."

² English editions:

Tit for Tat; or, American Fixings of English Humanity. By a Lady from New Orleans, London: Clarke, Beeton & Company, 1854, 8vo. pp. 352. [John Sabin, *A Dictionary of Books Relating to America from Its Discovery to the Present Time*, New York, 1934, XXV, 234.]

Tit for Tat; or, American Fixings of English Humanity. By a Lady, from New Orleans, U. S. London: Clarke and Beeton, 1855, pp. xii, 239. [The British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books, 1881-1900, Ann Arbor, 1946, XXVIII, 88.] Copy in the Boston Public Library Card Index has pp. xii, 344.

American editions:

Tit for Tat. A Novel. By a Lady of New Orleans, New York: Garret & Company; London: Clarke, Beeton & Company. c. 1856, 12 mo., pp. (2), iii, 356. [Sabin, p. 234.]

Tit for Tat. A Novel. By a Lady of New Orleans, 4th ed., New York: Dick and Fitzgerald, c. 1856, [The University of Minnesota Library Card Index.]

Orville A. Roorbach lists another copy as published by Garrett & Co. in 1857 in his *Addenda to the Bibliotheca Americana, a Catalogue of American Publications from May, 1855 to March, 1868*, New York, 1939, p. 230.

as one of several pro-slavery novels that carried the battle into the enemy's free country by

depicting the sufferings of the poorer classes in the North or in England, suffering sometimes contrasted with the happiness of the Southern blacks, sometimes standing alone in its woe. . . . Some of the novels which omit entirely plantation background, centering interest in foreign wretchedness are L. B. Chase's *English Serfdom and American Slavery* (New York, 1854), Marion Southwood's *Tit for Tat* (New York and London, 1856), S. H. Elliot's *New England Chattels* (New York, 1858), and, most remarkable of its class, W. T. Thompson's *The Slave Holder Abroad* (Phila., 1860), a labored compilation by a Georgia humorist demonstrating the profligacy, immorality, and brutality that marked English society.³

Mr. Gaines was correct in describing *Tit for Tat* as "centering interest in foreign wretchedness," but Claude Reherd Flory was nodding when he placed "M. Southwood, *Tit for Tat, a Reply to Dread* (1856)" with some fifteen other American novels penned in protest to *Uncle Tom's Cabin* as pretending "to picture southern life 'as it is,' . . . the pictures are almost uniformly roseate and romantic; the argument required it."⁴ But *Tit for Tat* is not a pro-slavery novel any more than *Moby Dick* is a treatise on the capture of whales. In fact, the author definitely takes an anti-slavery position:

. . . let us hope that the reader will not draw the inference that we are an advocate of slavery in all or any of its vicissitudes. No, reader, we have no love for it; and as heartily as we espouse independence of character, so we despise the hypocritical sycophant who, with his sham philanthropy, would conceal his own guilt. We readily admit the many evils incident to the institution of slavery; we regret the perplexity it now places us in; we would that some wise head devised a plan for its emancipation that could be carried into effect without endangering our social system. Nor do we come forward as apologists for the many evils incident to such a system, and which too often have their origin in the malpractices of foreigners, and Northerners who seek fortunes in the South, but have neither sympathy with the slave nor respect for the interests of the State.⁵

By classifying *Tit for Tat* as one of many pro-slavery works of fiction, literary historians have prevented its being recognized for what it really is: an attack in the form of a novel, based on authenticated source material, on the iniquitous practice of employing

³ Francis Pendleton Gaines, *The Southern Plantation, a Study in the Development and Accuracy of a Tradition*, New York, 1924, 45-47.

⁴ Claude Reherd Flory, *Economic Criticism in American Fiction, 1792 to 1900*, Philadelphia, 1936, 51-53.

⁵ *Tit for Tat*, 1st Am. ed. Unless otherwise noted, references will be to this edition.

small boys to sweep English flues in flagrant disregard of parliamentary acts forbidding such work.

Smarting under the hypocrisy of social and political leaders in England, weeping ostentatiously crocodile tears at the plight of the American Negroes picking cotton on southern plantations,—for English mills—and vexed at the triumphant tour of Mrs. Stowe through Scotland and England in the spring of 1853, the author, in protest to the smug interference in American affairs adopted by the adherents of "Tom-mania," determined to give the British a rebuke by playing off *Tit*, the climbing-boy, against *Tat*, the Negro slave. Although Blake, Montgomery, Hood, Lamb, Edgeworth, and Dickens had imaginatively depicted the woes of the little sootikins in poetry and verse no extended picture of their servitude had been romanticized until the publication of *Tit for Tat*,⁶ which with bitter invective and lashing scorn upbraided the "hypocritical sycophants" with their "sham philanthropy." While they were weeping over the "highly-coloured pages of 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' " toddlers of four and five years of age were burrowing through zig-zag flues to scrape out soot or extinguish fires in the great mansions of the West End of London. Forced up the stinking flues by callous, often drunken, masters who thrust awls in their tender bottoms and pins in the soles of the feet, the sweep-boys acquired running sores, over which saltpetre was rubbed to make them hard. Their bodies unwashed for months led to the dreaded Chimney-Sweep's Cancer; their soft bones turned crooked from carrying heavy bags of soot; their empty bellies, unprotected sides, and restless sleep in soot-begrimed cellars brought to many hacking consumption. Sold by their starving parents for a few shillings or taken from the alms-houses, the miserable little fellows were doomed to lead the lives of social outcasts, if they survived suffocation in the flues or fires on the hearths. These were the subjects that *Tit for Tat* presented to shame into silence the voluble partisans of Mrs. Stowe.

The English presses, according to the author, heaped "unmitigated abuse" on the novel for so impudently exposing the glaring enormity of the wicked practice of using boys as animated scrapers.⁷ The staid, highly respected *Athenaeum*, on January 20, 1855, con-

⁶ *Tit for Tat* is the first novel to present a realistic picture of the miseries of the climbing-boys. Charles Kingsley's *Water Babies* is a charming idyll that glosses over Tom's sufferings by transforming him into a sea urchin, thereby losing any propaganda value.

⁷ *Tit for Tat*, ii. Except in *The Athenaeum*, I have found no critical reviews in English or American periodicals.

veniently ignoring the smiling tributes it had recently paid to Mrs. Stowe's abolitionary works, frowningly denounced *Tit for Tat* for "the misuse of Fiction as applied to social abuses."⁸ Perhaps, the *Athenaeum* was really irritated that an American dared to point out the defect in a society that permitted such barbaric cruelty to go unchecked.

II. British Origins and Editions

British interference in American social problems concerning Negro slavery came to definite action in 1853 when the Duchesses of Argyll, Bedford, and Sutherland, the Countess of Shaftesbury, Vis-countess Palmerston, Mrs. Tennyson, Mrs. Dickens and a score of other outstanding ladies of London's social, philanthropic, and literary circles, met at Stafford House, town residence of the Duke of Sutherland,⁹ to draw up, under Lord Shaftesbury's humane guidance, "An Affectionate and Christian Address of Many Thousands of Women of Great Britain and Ireland to Their Sisters, the Women of The United States of America," wherein they besought their cherished American sisters to be active in the fight to abolish Negro slavery. This noble proposal was not received with the sympathy and understanding that its proponents had intended. It boomeranged on the noble and kind-hearted ladies who had instigated its conception, as well as on the thousands of their British signatories. Mrs. Tyler, wife of the ex-President, replied on behalf of indignant American womanhood in the South that the kettle was calling the pot black:

"Leave it," she said, "to the women of the South to alleviate the sufferings of the dependents, while you take care of your own. The negro of the South lives sumptuously, in comparison with a hundred thousand of your white population in London."¹⁰

Mrs. Tyler's outspoken rebuttal did not quench the thirst for retaliation. A decade later Lord Shaftesbury was confessing to the House of Lords:

I have received from America at various times letters from persons rebuking me for the part which I have taken, and which, with the blessing

⁸ *The Athenaeum*, No. 1421, January 20, 1855, 80.

⁹ From a letter in *The Times*, August 7, 1834, it appears that the Duke of Sutherland was interested in the cause of abolishing the use of sweep-boys by having the chimneys of Stafford House adapted for sweeping machines.

¹⁰ Edwin Hodder, *The Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury*, K.G., London, 1886, II, 438.

of God, I always will take, in favour of the extinction of slavery—rebuking me and at the same time asserting that a state of things exists in England with regards to young children ten times worse than anything which exists in relation to negro children in any part of South America.¹¹

A more powerful protest than batches of letters denouncing the officiousness of British womanhood appeared in *Tit for Tat*, published in 1854 by Clarke, Beeton and Company, the same firm that had brought out the first pirated English edition of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*.

In the dedication of *Tit for Tat*, dated New Orleans, 1854, the author not only scornfully derides the proposal of the British ladies but also sees in the homage paid throughout the United Kingdom to Mrs. Stowe on her heralded march from Glasgow to London an affront to Southern aristocracy:

The insult offered to us, as Proprietors of the Southern States, by the manner in which Mrs. Beecher Stowe and her vaunted "Uncle Tom" were received in England, as well as by the Memorial of the British Ladies, instigated myself and a few more proprietors to achieve something more than an immediate reply to that memorial. It determined us to watch for our opportunity of unmistakably showing up to the world, in their true colours, the real worth and character of all that British enthusiasm that "Uncle Tom" called forth across the Atlantic.

However abundantly the English aristocracy may choose to moisten their French cambrics over the tinsel pages of an American romance, the facts contained in the following pages will prove how much more ready the Britishers are to shed tears over our faults than to attempt the more Christian correction of their own.

Whatever the defects of our peculiar institutions may be, the following pages will prove to the Northerners of the Union that the errors of their British friends far exceed ours at this very hour, by the confession of their own magistrates. . . .

Whenever a sad tale of the murder and oppression of our citizens is told in our Senate, we do not receive the humiliating and inflicting intelligence with roars of mirth and shouts of laughter, nor reject, by a majority of two to one, any measures to protect the persons and rights of free-born whites, merely because they are poor.¹²

Then, after excoriating the callousness of such champions of liberty in the Commons as Cobden, Bright, Roebuck, Spenser Walpole, and Spooner, "the strait-laced champion of the Established Church," for refusing to help the friendless sweep-boys, the torrent concludes with the warning:

¹¹ Thomas C. Hansard, *The Parliamentary Debates from the Year 1803 to the Present Time*, London, 1863, 3rd Ser. CLXXII, 1337.

¹² *Tit for Tat*, English ed., 1855, ix-x.

After this, let the British intermeddlers refer with censure, if they dare, to the domestic institutions of our Southern States. When they next criticize our Fugitive Slave Law, we shall understand the full measure of their hypocrisy, and have our answer ready.¹³

This chauvinistic declaration of battle is signed "Julia."

Following the author's dedication is a letter, dated London, May 21, 1854, addressed to "My dear Mrs. * *," and signed "Stars and Stripes." "Stars and Stripes" describes how, sitting under the Speaker's Gallery in the Commons on the night of the second reading of a measure to regulate more stringently the trade of chimney-sweeping than the existing Act of 1840, he observed the majority of the members gave no attention to the impassioned pleadings of such forceful speakers as Liddell, Keating, and Ackland, who pointed out that the little boys faced atrocities

as horrible as any that these Britishers ever wept over in the highly-coloured pages of "Uncle Tom's Cabin." . . . the buying and selling of British children at five shillings a-head—the roasting them alive—the boiling them alive—and the suffocating them—these horrors were received with roars of laughter; while members were heard to say to one another on the ministerial side of the House—

"We don't care for their sweeping-boys. Happen what may, we are not going to have our houses burnt down."¹⁴

The story itself, based on material found in the *Minutes of Evidence taken before the Select Committee of the House of Lords, appointed to inquire into the expediency or in expediency of the Regulations contained in the Chimney Sweepers' Regulation Act Amendment Bill, printed June 7, 1853*, and from other equally reliable sources,¹⁵ placed in the Appendix, has as hero, Eustatius (Totty), four-year-old Earl of Hopemore, who, soon after the action starts, is stolen from the London residence of his loving father, the proud Marquis of Hardheart. His rich clothes replaced by filthy rags, his golden curls cropped from his cherubic head, the little earl is flung into the soot cellar of a Manchester tenement where he shares a bed of soot-sacks with a boy dying of small-pox:

Through all that night the little earl continued to groan, and cry, and sob. Alas! no one attended to him. Whether he lived or died seemed a matter of perfect indifference to everyone in the den into which he

¹³ *Ibid.*, xii.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, xvi. The Bill was lost by a majority of 112 *Noes* to 39 *Ayes*.

¹⁵ The character of the cruelly-indifferent Marquis of Hardheart was drawn from Lord Beaumont; Peter Hall and William Hood were the names of benevolent friends of the climbing-boys.

had fallen; and when the early beams of the sun shot down into that hideous cellar, the poor child was still awake, groaning beneath violent pains in the back and loins, suffering under a dreadful nausea, his skin and throat parched with drought, and every now and then making futile efforts to vomit.¹⁶

A veterinarian called in to examine the two boys asks Mother Redcap, the crone who supplied them with bread and water, why she could not take better care for their welfare. She replies:

Poor folks like us must get our livelihood; and if the gentlefolks will not have their chimneys swept by this newfangled machinery, why, in course, they must have boys; and if we must have boys, they must rough it a bit. In a dirty business like ours what can you expect? Be we do wash the boys after every chimney, eighteen or twenty a day? and if they bean't to be washed, where are they to sleep except in such a cellar as this? Why you ill-mannered old brute! you are only fit to attend cows, you bean't; [sic] coming here snacking us with these poor children's deaths! Why don't you go and snack the magistrates?—them's the villains. Why don't you go and snack the rich mill-owners? them's the scoundrels, not us poor bodies. It is them rich folks that won't have their chimneys swept by machinery, and will have them climbed by boys, that does the harm and murders the children.¹⁷

Since his unconscious companion could take no nourishment, little Totty had for himself the wine bottle full of Epsom salts diluted with water and a little muriatic acid, and a few crusts of bread that might have been gathered from the kennel above their window. No sooner had the dying boy's jaw fallen in death than the author asks:

What think you, citizens of America, of the humanity of the Britishers, who can give up their children by the thousand to be systematic victims of such a trade?—a trade wholly unnecessary to exist at all, yet, if allowed to exist in climbing children, then of necessity involving such hideous details.¹⁸

In the room above Totty's cellar, Tom Burman, the chimney-sweeper who had kidnapped the little earl, is furious that Totty cannot be as assistance to him for some weeks because of the weakness from his severe illness. He grumbles to Mother Redcap "Well, then, I s'pose there's no help for it but buying another." "¹⁸ His concern over the necessary outlay of five or six shillings for another apprentice is lessened when the old hag points out the advantages of a boy over a machine:

¹⁶ *Tit for Tat*, 94.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 96.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 97.

"Instead of standing by the hearth, with your hands in your pockets, while the boy sweeps the chimney, look at the hard work of one of them 'ere long machines a-working up and down the chimney at every house you go to!"¹⁹

Burman's new boy, Samuel Whitt, was so small that he would have sold for more than the five shillings Burman paid his master for him, if he had not been in ill health. Totty noticed with horror, as a sleepy cook was raking the red hot ashes out of a grate one morning, how emaciated and bruised his fellow sweep appeared to be as he made ready for his first ascent under the direction of his latest master. Taking off his shirt, lest it should crumble in the elbow of the flue and prevent his moving, and putting on a filthy sooty cap over his head and face, he

entered the chimney with his brush, exhibiting as he did so his neck covered with scars and bruises, his elbows all raw and bleeding, and all down the course of his back, where the projections of the spine stood plainly out from long starvation, a mass of bleeding scars presented themselves, from constant collision with the rough and jagged sides of the chimneys. The soot, of course, impregnated all his festering and bleeding wounds.²⁰

As usual, Burman sat on the fender, his arms crossed in idleness, until the tired boy came out from behind the dirty baize curtain stretched across the fireplace to prevent the soot from escaping into the room. Then, collecting his money, he commanded the boys to gather the soot-bags together and set off with them for the next client. After cleaning eleven chimneys without any rest and without adequate nourishment, Sam was so exhausted that Burman had to half carry him into the cellar where he threatened fiendish tortures if the two boys did not screen the soot. As Sam feebly picked out the cinders, Burman was guzzling gin at the corner pub. Such a scene offered a target for another attack on British legislators:

And this is the system which the aristocracy of England, the rich peers, the rich magistrates, the rich mill-owners, the rich Mr. George Garr Glyn, M.P., Mr. Cobden, M.P., Mr. Bright, M.P., Mr. Roebuck, M.P., Sir Benjamin Hall, M.P., Sir John Shelley, M.P., Mr. Alexander Hastie, M.P., Mr. Edward Miall, M.P., Mr. Phinn, M.P., and other strenuous supporters of liberty, are upholding by their votes in the year of grace 1854! Think of this, English constituencies! How proud you ought to be of such members!²¹

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 101.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 120.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 124.

Destiny did not allow Samuel Whitt to sweep many flues for Burman. One day in scraping the soot from the sides of a flue still hot from a recent fire, the puny lad became fixed in an elbow. In vain his master and a carpenter tried to extricate him until finally Burman climbed up the flue as far as his great bulk would permit and grasped in his relentless paws the little, slender, emaciated legs of this poor child; then hanging the whole of his herculean body with its full weight to them, and finding that the poor, delicate child was not moved by it, he sung out, "Now, hang on me, below there, carpenter."

Quick at the word, the carpenter, a full-sized man, stepping up into the chimney and catching hold of Tom's foot, hung to him.

"Oh! oh! oh!" screeched the poor little creature, torn by this terrific violence, bleeding, bruised, and mangled by the sharp edges of the bricks, between which he had stuck.²²

A few hours later in great agony Samuel Whitt died, as Burman was swilling down gin and cursing his misfortune in losing so many boys.

Burman is on the point of training Totty to climb flues when a kind-hearted Quaker, William Wood, persuades him to use a machine which he loans him. Wood's interest in Totty, however, makes Burman apprehensive lest Totty should inadvertently betray the fact of his kidnapping; so he decamps one night with child and machine. When wealthy Lady Burmeister refuses to allow him to use a machine in her multi-flued country house, Burmeister disgustedly tosses the child-saving device into a pond and bargains for nine-year-old Harry Redmain. As Totty accompanies Harry from house to house, they meet the unhappy son of a dissenting minister, who apprenticed the boy to a sweep and forbade him to attend Sunday School lest, by learning how to read and write, he become discontented with his trade. They watch a number of men pull the burned body of a sweep-boy from a boiler where he had been overcome by poisonous gasses, and they learn that his cruel master is cleared on technical grounds of the charge of manslaughter. They share the same roof as a master-sweep who suffers the agonies of his trade, cancer of the scrotum, caused by going for months without washing. In time, Harry runs away from Burman, and then Totty is given his first lesson in ascending flues. Beaten and kicked, until in desperation he seeks refuge in the dark, evil-appearing, stinking flue, he is forced to scramble up a few feet as Burman viciously thrusts a sharp awl in the boy's bottom. Unused

²² *Ibid.*, 139.

to the knack of gaining leverage by depending upon his elbows and knees, the half-crazed lad, unable to inch his way any further, whimpers and shrieks as Burman jabs time and again the sharp instrument into his tender flesh. Just as the ferocious master is lighting a fire on the hearth, the approved method of forcing sweep-boys to climb, a constable, having heard Totty's cries, breaks in the door and arrests Burman on charges of attempted manslaughter.

The last quarter of the story, from the courtroom scene, where Burman is sentenced to transportation and Totty is placed in the custody of Lady Charlotte D'Auberville and her lovable daughter, Gwinnethlyn, becomes a stereotyped sentimental romance. Totty, educated at a good public school, qualifies for a midshipman's position in the merchant marine. In Russia he steals plans of secret fortifications, which he delivers to the British Prime Minister, and becomes at once a celebrity in London's drawing-rooms. Of course, he falls in love with beautiful Gwinnethlyn whose mother consents to their marriage only after a most unusual concatenation of astonishing adventures has revealed that Totty is the son of the wealthy and powerful Marquis of Hardheart. The final paragraph of the story returns to the flues as the author, more or less paraphrasing the "Affectionate and Christian Address," admonishes British readers:

. . . you are called upon by the ties of humanity and the command of Heaven to discharge your own individual responsibility in this matter, before you are entitled to say one word to your brothers in the United States against their slave institutions. Free your own slaves first from the chimneys of your own firesides. Man, woman, or child, you are bound at once to go forth into society, and never to cease your aid, assistance, and exertions, until you have removed for ever from the soil of Britain the disgrace and the curse of her present system of climbing-boys!²³

III. American Editions

Following the general practice of American writers who did not wish to travel to the United Kingdom to make on British soil an application for copyrighting their works to protect their royalties, the author of *Tit for Tat* gave the manuscript first to a London firm for publication and two years later to an American. In the first American edition, brought out by the New York firm of

²³ *Ibid.*, 348.

Garret and Company, that had taken out copyright in 1856,²⁴ we find that in addition to a change of title, *Tit for Tat. A Novel. By a Lady of New Orleans*, the dedication and letter by "Stars and Stripes" have given way to a preface, signed "The Author" and dated at White Sulphur Springs, August, 1856. Perhaps by oversight, the initial "J" is retained at the conclusion of the story in the American edition.

The preface explains to the American public how the author happened to select the English climbing-boy as a subject for a humanitarian novel to be used as a retaliatory measure against British meddlesome interference in American affairs and how ungraciously the work was received by the English reviews:

The year of grace, Eighteen Hundred and Fifty-four, will be memorable in England, for the breaking out of the Uncle Tom fever. A chronic ophthalmia overspread the vision of English Humanitarians, who, look at what they might, could see nothing but specks of black. They were haunted by black spectres. In all the races of the Earth, none were worthy of pity unless its color was black.

The Black fever was at its height, when I took it kindly. The English, acclimated to the home disease, caught it from America. I, an American, was infected in England.

There is a race of beings, by the initiated, facetiously denominated "chummies," which exists only in humane Britain. Outside barbarians call them chimney-sweeps. This race is black, not from blood, but from soot.

I beheld specimens of these crippled, distorted, bleeding bits of humanity, and, at sight, was taken down by a sympathetic fever. In my paroxysms, I would exclaim—"Oh! ye Dukes and Duchesses! ye Lords and Commons! ye Priests and Laymen! who lift up your hands and let fall your tears at the woes of Uncle Tom, thousands of miles away; heard ye never the wailing cry of the poor 'chummy' who weeps daily on your thresholds? Oh! Sutherland House! Oh! Exeter Hall! whose walls reverberate with shrieks for freedom to the African; have ye no echoes for the wretched children who shriek for relief from torture on your hearthstones?"

In my lucid intervals I reflected that the morning plaint of the chimney-sweep was uttered at an hour when philanthropists sleep. That philanthropists never hear it. That they were ignorant of its existence. They shall remain ignorant no longer, thought I, so I wrote my book.

The public was grateful, so were my publishers; for the book sold. I have always thought the philanthropists were the same, but they never

²⁴ A letter of December 8, 1949, from the Reference Department, Rare Books Division, Library of Congress, states that apparently no separate title page for the American edition of *Tit for Tat* was deposited for copyright in 1855, 1856, or 1857. The title is, however, recorded in a register kept by the Court Clerk of the U. S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, under the date of October 7, 1856, and gives Garret & Co. as proprietors.

told me so. They were too busy, at the moment, with Mrs. Stowe and the Black Swan. . . .²⁵

Having satirized the ruling classes of England for hypocritical near-sightedness to the misery in their own chimneys, as they peered across three thousand miles of ocean to the Uncle Toms on the plantations in the South, the author preceeded to castigate the English press for the severe drubbing given the novel and for denying the facts "although in every case they are verified by official documents and reports." In fact, the English press, like the philanthropists, "could see no wrongs to poor humanity, save such as were inflicted outside Her Majesty's dominions." Far different was the reception of the entire press of Scotland which endorsed all the statements, appreciated the motives for writing the work, and approved the effort of bringing to the public's attention "a righteous cause," the abolition of the employment of climbing-boys.

IV. Authorship

The two contenders²⁶ for the authorship of *Tit for Tat* can muster up a sufficient array of impressive authorities from catalogue cards and bibliographical studies to make his or her claim a most vexing one to settle. For instance, Matthew Estes, acknowledged author of *A Defence of Negro Slavery, as It Exists in the United States*,²⁷ 1846, has at his back the catalogues of the Library of Congress, the Huntington Library, and the Howard Memorial Library

²⁵ *Tit for Tat*, i-ii. The statement contains several inaccuracies:

a. Public acclaim of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* in England appears to have reached its zenith during the triumphant tour of Mrs. Stowe in the late spring of 1853 when she met the Black Swan, Miss Greenfield, a freed Negress from Alabama.

b. Negro climbing-boys were used extensively in the South and competed with white in parts of the North as late as 1885.

c. Lord Shaftesbury from 1840 to 1875 fought in Parliament to enact legislation to abolish the employment of sweep-boys.

²⁶ *The Athenaeum*, on February 17, 1855 claimed to have proof from the U. S. Legation at London that an Englishman authored *Tit for Tat* and had approached Publisher Beeton for aid in securing the services of an American attaché to write enough of the manuscript to secure an American copyright. His request was refused on the grounds that the work was frankly abusive of England. In the next issue (February 24) *The Athenaeum* was forced to admit that it had received a letter from "F. C. Adams" stating that he was not the author of *Tit for Tat*, as *The Athenaeum* had asserted. Because of its mistaken attribution, the periodical, according to the preface in *Tit for Tat*, was compelled to make a public apology and pay costs in an action for slander.

²⁷ Matthew Estes, *A Defence of Negro Slavery, as It Exists in the United States*, Montgomery: Press of the Alabama Journal, 1846.

of New Orleans, as well as listing in Donald E. Thompson's *A Bibliography of Louisiana Books and Pamphlets in the T. P. Thompson Collection of the University of Alabama Library*,²⁸ and C. L. McVoy's *A Bibliography of Fiction by Louisianians and on Louisiana Subjects*.²⁹ Marion Southwood, recognized authoress of "*Beauty and Booty*," the *Watchword of New Orleans*,³⁰ can claim the reassuring catalogues of the New York Public Library, the Columbia University Library, the Ohio State University Library, the University of Minnesota Library, the Princeton University Library, and the Newberry Library, with references in Munroe Work's *Bibliography of the Negro in Africa and America*³¹ and in the previously mentioned histories of Francis Pendleton Gaines and Claude Reherd Flory.

Although the forces on each side appear impregnable, they have many hidden flaws as the result of too much interdependence. A strong blow in the direction of the authenticity of the ascription upheld by the Library of Congress could easily topple over the adherents of the Estes' faction; but just as easily might the Southwood partisans be confused if their champion, John Sabin, were declared unreliable.

The Estes' contenders have based their decisions upon the judgment of the Library of Congress inasmuch as there is a general practice in dealing with anonymous and pseudonymous works for librarians and scholars to rely upon its opinions. In ascribing *Tit for Tat* to Matthew Estes, the Processing Department of the Library of Congress cites for its authority an undated report in its files "from the late William Beers . . . for many years librarian of the Howard Memorial Library of New Orleans, and a careful bibliographer."³² The Howard Memorial Library, where Mr. Beers carried on his research investigations, catalogues its copy of *Tit for Tat* under Estes because it follows the attribution of the Library of Congress.

Marion Southwood's mavericks, for the most part, follow the reference in John Sabin's *A Dictionary of Books Relating to America*;

²⁸ Donald E. Thompson, *A Bibliography of Louisiana Books and Pamphlets in the T. P. Thompson Collection of the University of Alabama Library*, Montgomery, 1947.

²⁹ C. L. McVoy, *A Bibliography of Fiction by Louisianians and on Louisiana Subjects*, Baton Rouge, 1935.

³⁰ Marion Southwood, "*Beauty and Booty*," the *Watchword of New Orleans*. By Marion Southwood, a Lady of New Orleans, New York, 1867.

³¹ Munroe Work, *Bibliography of the Negro in Africa and America*, New York, 1928.

³² Letter, dated November 9, 1949, from the Processing Department, Library of Congress.

however, it must be noted that Sabin places *Tit for Tat* under title and not under author, whereas he lists "*Beauty and Booty*" under Southwood and *A Defence* under Estes. But he infers that Southwood authored *Tit for Tat* by pointing out that "Lady of New Orleans" was the pseudonym adopted by Marion Southwood and employed by her on the title page of "*Beauty and Booty*."

Sabin is not alone in crediting "Lady of New Orleans" as Marion Southwood's pseudonym. William Cushing in *Initials and Pseudonyms* has Southwood, Marion. A lady of New Orleans. An American writer of the day,"³³ and Halkett and Laing in their *Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous English Literature* have "'Lady (a) of New Orleans'—Marion Southwood."³⁴

A painstaking search of biographies, bibliographies, and literary histories and dozens of letters sent to libraries and historical societies and municipal offices in New Orleans and Columbus, Mississippi, have yielded nothing about the life of Marion Southwood and only a meager account of Matthew Estes, nor have queries published in such widely read periodicals as *Notes and Queries* and *American Notes and Queries* brought forth any further information. We know that the Estes family in America was founded by a Matthew Estes of Dover, England, who settled in Salem, Massachusetts, in 1676. One of his descendants may have been the Dr. M. Estes, mentioned in Lipscomb's *History* as having served the [Christian] Church of Columbus, Mississippi, every Sabbath "when there was no ordained preacher to officiate."³⁵ The *Library of Southern Literature* very briefly notes that Matthew Estes "resided at Columbus, Miss., and wrote *A Defence of Negro Slavery in the United States* (Montgomery, Ala., 1846)."³⁶

A comparison of Estes' *Defence* with the anonymous *Tit for Tat* leads me to conclude that the two works did not come from the same pen. As a firm pro-slavery man, Estes explains in his introduction that he has been induced to express his views on the subject of slavery "from a conviction of their truth, and from a desire to contribute something towards removing the errors that exist in the public mind, upon this subject."³⁷ By avoiding "harsh epithets"

³³ William Cushing, *Initials and Pseudonyms; a Dictionary of Literary Disguises*, New York, 1888, 284.

³⁴ Samuel Halkett and John Laing, *Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous English Literature*, Edinburgh, 1926, I, 184.

³⁵ W. L. Lipscomb, *A History of Columbus, Mississippi during the Nineteenth Century*, Birmingham, 1909, 111.

³⁶ *Library of Southern Literature*, New Orleans, 1910, XIV, 139.

³⁷ Estes, I.

and by placing the subject "upon the grounds of reason alone," he has abstained from "an appeal to the passions." After expounding upon such topics as Slavery among the Jews, Slavery in the Light of Christianity, African Slavery, and Southern Slavery, he pontificates that slavery may be upheld on historical, religious, moral, and economic grounds. England's opposition to slavery, he decided, is based on selfish not philanthropic motives. In the same strain as the later pro-slavery fiction writers of the 1850's, Estes notes how visitors to the South always remark that the slaves are "contented, happy, light-hearted, and full of amusement," far happier than the poor whites in the Northern mills. Furthermore, they are better off than the over-taxed and under-fed masses in England where a standing army keeps them in subjection. By his Christian forbearance of using harsh expressions, of arousing his readers' emotions, and of appealing to their non-rational responses, Estes has turned out a dull, ineffectual sermon, based principally upon doubtful historical conclusions.

On the other hand, the author of *Tit for Tat* was no advocate of slavery and was anxious to see it abolished. Nor did this unknown author hesitate, in the fight to put an end to the employment of sweep-boys, to arouse the readers' blood pressures by such devices as hurling sarcasm and irony at the heads of reactionary legislators, or depicting tear-provoking scenes founded on actual case-histories, or exhorting a whole nation to slough off its evil at once. Matthew Estes could no more have changed his style, even if he had changed his whole concept of the righteousness of slavery, than as a preacher he would have attempted to hide his manly figure behind a feminine pseudonym. How he would have been laughed at in his pulpit in the Columbus church if his parishioners had ever learned that he had signed himself as "Julia" or "Lady of New Orleans."

"*Beauty and Booty*" has far more in common with *Tit for Tat* than Estes' labored work. A hasty reading of the introduction of "*Beauty and Booty*," however, casts doubt whether Marion Southwood wrote both since she states:

"Tis the first time, and, I am fully persuaded in my own mind, it will be the last, that my name will appear before the public.³⁸

Yet this denial of her name having been before the public earlier than 1867 does not preclude her having written *Tit for Tat*, which

³⁸ "*Beauty and Booty*," 11.

appeared with a pseudonym. In fact, she may have found that the anonymity of her first work was a blessing that the second did not have; consequently, she determined, hereafter, to retire behind the cloak of her pseudonym. The motive for writing "*Beauty and Booty*" came from a strong outside force, as strong as that which gave life to *Tit for Tat*: retaliation. Burning with a desire to shout forth the injustice and corruptness of the rule of General Butler in New Orleans, Marion Southwood gathered together her papers to describe "our season of affliction in New Orleans, while we were blockaded, and while General Butler was 'Commander-in-chief of the Department of the Gulf.'"³⁹

With vitriol for ink and a scapel for a pen, Marion Southwood angrily dashed off a narrative of her personal experiences in New Orleans when General Butler ruled over it with iron-gloved hand. Her assertions for many of the callous regulations and confiscatory demands of the scheming Yankees were backed by copies of official communications, general orders from military headquarters, newspaper excerpts, and messages of the common council. Just as the British legislators and philanthropists were the targets for the sarcastic thrusts in *Tit for Tat*, so General Butler and his staff received the ironical cuts and thrusts in "*Beauty and Booty*." Butler, his face red from drinking too freely of "*molasses and water*," was Simon Legree incarnate:

Who can read that delightful work, entitled "Uncle Tom's Cabin," and not recognize our "arch fiend tormentor" in the description of Mr. Simon Legree. We can but imagine, as Mrs. Stowe hailed [sic] from Massachusetts, that she must have had him in her mind's eye.⁴⁰

Lacking the organized plan of *Tit for Tat*, "*Beauty and Booty*," nevertheless, has a swing and sincerity that carries the reader over much irrelevant material, so carelessly inserted that the writer's haste to get along with publication of her and her fellow townsmen's woes is very apparent.

These two works, the reminiscences of captured New Orleans and the story of England's climbing-boys, share a similarity of style: the same use of italics for emphasis, the same fondness for displaying French phrases, the same delight in frequent apostrophes, the same pleasure in sarcastic diatribes and ironic understatements, and the same nervous fluency in sentence structure. Also, they both employ contemporary source materials; and they both were

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 213

published in the heart of the enemy's territory, *Tit for Tat* in England, later New York, and "*Beauty and Booty*" in New York.

Despite the influential decision of the Library of Congress, which, after all, was based only on the unsubstantiated report of William Beer, it would seem that Marion Southwood has a better claim to the authorship of *Tit for Tat* than Matthew Estes. Certainly it is not likely that a gospel preacher would for his second novel decide to use such a feminine pseudonym as "Lady of New Orleans," whereas Marion Southwood employed it in conjunction with her own name in her first publicly acknowledged work. Next, a comparison between Estes' *Defence* and *Tit for Tat* reveals a gulf in the use of material, in style, and in attitude toward slavery; on the other hand, a comparison between *Tit for Tat* and Southwood's "*Beauty and Booty*" shows a decided similarity in style, in employing contemporary material for interest, and in fondness for satire. Finally, the attack on Mrs. Stowe in *Tit for Tat* bespeaks more the attitude of an irritated woman than a man who has piously expressed a desire to abstain from an "appeal to the passions."

GEORGE L. PHILLIPS

San Diego State College, California

Editor's Note. Anyone wishing to read more from the pen of Professor Phillips upon the history of climbing boys will find the following references of particular interest and profit: *England's Climbing Boys, A History of the Long Struggle to Abolish Child Labor in Chimney-Sweeping*, Publication Number 5 of The Kress Library of Business and Economics, Harvard School of Business Administration, Soldiers Field, Boston, Massachusetts, 1949; "The Chimney Sweeper's Friend and Climbing Boy's Album," Part 5, Volume VI of the *Transactions of the Hunter Archaeological Society*, Sheffield, England; "Two Seventeenth-Century Flue-Fakers, Toolers, and Rampmen," in *Folk-Lore*, LXII, June, 1951; "The Clean Conscience of a Dirty Sweep," in *Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly*, July, 1951; "Climbing Boys of Scotland," in *The Scots Magazine*, September, 1951.

Viceroy Toledo and the University of San Marcos

Francisco de Toledo, fifth viceroy of Peru (1569-1581), has many claims to fame. The list of his accomplishments as an administrator is impressive. His strong rule marks the end of more than three decades of bloodshed and disorder in Peru as the *conquistadores* butchered first the Indians and then one another over the spoils of the conquest. His legal code systematized the administration of the colony, and under his watchful eye taxes and tribute were more efficiently collected. He carried out a program for Indian labor which, though harsh by modern standards, put definite legal limits to Spanish cupidity. At the head of colonial troops he fostered explorations and enlarged the area of Spanish control. His interest in providing roads, bridges, and internal security gave an important stimulus to growing trade and industry.¹

On the other hand, the viceroy has his critics, both in his day and ours. No one who proceeded with such vigorous initiative could possibly have escaped criticism. Nevertheless, some of the strictures seem justified. Toledo rode roughshod over all opposition to his authority which, though broad by definition, he was inclined to stretch to its absolute limits, and beyond. He tried to silence all opposition by the clergy who spoke out against his Indian program of forced labor and the theological grounds on which he attempted to support it.² His heavy hand fell upon priests and friars who tried to defend their freedom against the claims

¹ The standard biographies of Toledo are, Roberto Levillier, *Francisco de Toledo, supremo organizador del Perú, su vida, su obra*, Buenos Aires, 1935, 4 vols.; Arthur F. Zimmerman, *Francisco de Toledo, Fifth Viceroy of Peru, 1569-1581*, Caldwell, Idaho, 1938.

² Toledo had a survey made, the "Informaciones," and a history written, *Historia de las Incas*, by Pedro Sarmiento de Gamboa, to justify Spanish title to the Indies on the basis of the tyranny and degradation of Inca rule. Of these arguments the Peruvian Jesuit Provincial, Acosta, said, "We must reject those false titles of dominion which some persons are trying to propagate, unnecessary defenders of the royal authority in my opinion, not to say deceivers, who would prove by their assertions the tyranny of the Incas . . . which we do not understand and do not admit. For it is not lawful to rob a thief, nor does the crime committed by someone else add to our own justice." Lewis Hanke, "Viceroy Francisco de Toledo and the Just Titles of Spain to the Inca Empire," *Americas*, III (July, 1946), 15. For a hostile Peruvian appraisal of Toledo, see Luis Valcárcel *El virrey Toledo, gran tirano del Perú, una revisión histórica*, Lima, 1940.

of the state which under the broad terms of the *patronato real* sought to reduce the Church to the status of a branch of the bureaucracy.³

But whether the man was a tyrant in his own right or merely the efficient tool of absolutism, the fact must be faced that Peru, and particularly Lima, prospered under his regime. Not merely was there a tremendous development of the material riches of the land, but the spiritual and intellectual side of Peruvian life began to flourish. Irving Leonard has recorded the astonishing transformation of *Limeño* society from the days of the illiterate goatherd, who first won Peru for Spain, to the culture and refinement of the Lima aristocracy less than forty years later.⁴ Certainly, no small credit for that development must go to Toledo himself, who established the rule of law in which such a way of life may thrive.

His influence on the cultural growth of Peru was more than just an indirect one. He was immediately concerned, for example, with the development of an educational system for the colony. Particularly, he guided and fostered the growth of the University of Lima, which today under the title of the National University of San Marcos is celebrating four hundred years of existence and challenged only by the University of Mexico in its claim to be the oldest in the hemisphere.⁵ Toledo's biographers have shown only passing interest in this phase of his rule.⁶ Moreover, until recently much of the documentation concerning Toledo's

³ On November 28, 1579, a few months after his arrival, Toledo called the heads of the religious orders together and read them the decree of royal patronage (*patronato*) over the Church. Zimmerman, 265. Under this authority Toledo could call any priest before him to answer for his acts, and if necessary expel him. All priests were required to be presented, examined, and licensed before they began their work or they would get no salary. *Ibid.*, 128-9. The clergy's protest against this limitation of their freedom set off a long controversy continuing throughout the viceroy's reign in the course of which he tried to reduce the Orders and prelates to his authority. According to his apologist, Levillier, this policy was necessary because the clergy in Peru had gotten so far out of hand that the king's rights under the *patronato real* were mere illusions. Roberto Levillier, *Ordenanzas de don Francisco de Toledo, virrey del Perú, 1569-1581*, Madrid, 1929, vii.

⁴ Irving A. Leonard, "Best Sellers of the Lima Book Trade," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXII (February, 1942), 5ff.

⁵ For the San Marcos side of this controversy see Luis A. Eguiguren, *La Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos*, Lima, 1951, 63ff.

⁶ Zimmerman, *Toledo*, has one page (240) on the subject. Levillier's *Toledo* and his *Ordenanzas* have nothing on the university. Much of the material for this paper was gathered in Lima while the writer was giving a series of lectures at San Marcos and the Catholic University of Lima during the summer of 1950.

relations with the university was unavailable. Since the publication of Father Vargas Ugarte's guide to some of these materials in the *Archivo de Indias* and the subsequent printing of those and many other documents in the bulky and repetitive volumes of Eguiguren, it is possible to work out a coherent history of Toledo's connection with university affairs.⁷

The university at Lima originated more than twenty years before the viceroy's arrival in Peru in the decision of a provincial meeting of the Dominican Order held at Cuzco in 1548. The friars there decided to establish a *studium generale* or university following the pattern of contemporary institutions in Europe.⁸ The site chosen was the Dominican monastery of Rosario in Lima. The Chapter promised a small subvention of 300 pesos annually and the free services of four Dominican teachers.⁹

The following year the *cabildo* of Lima took a hand in the project. In selecting two procurators to represent the city before the king, their choice fell upon Jerónimo Aliaga, secretary of the Audiencia, and Fray Tomás de San Martín, provincial of the Peruvian Dominicans and most zealous in the cause of the proposed school.¹⁰ Just before the two men left for Spain they were given instructions to solicit from the Court the formal authorization for a university modelled on the plan of the famous Salamanca.¹¹ In this way the machinery was started that produced the famous royal order of May 12, 1551, which gave the school legal existence.¹²

⁷ Ruben Vargas Ugarte, S.J., *Manuscritos Peruanos del Archivo de Indias*, Lima, 1938, 197ff; Luis A. Eguiguren, *Alma Mater. Orígenes de la universidad de Lima*, Lima, 1939; and by the same author, *Diccionario histórico cronológico de la real y pontificia universidad de San Marcos y sus colegios*, Lima, 1940-49, 2 vols. The chroniclers, Meléndez, Calancha, Córdova Salinas, Echave y Assu, Pedro Peralta, and others, wrote at length on the university, but they must be used with caution except where they have direct knowledge.

⁸ Eguiguren, *Alma Mater*, 96.

⁹ Eguiguren, *San Marcos*, 25.

¹⁰ Entries of December 10 and 11, 1549, in Bertram T. Lee, ed., *Libros de Cabildos de Lima*, Lima, 1935, IV (1548-1553), 210-214.

¹¹ Included in the instructions to the procurators is a letter from the *cabildo* to the king which contains the following paragraph: "Yten que por que enestas partes estan tan Remotas despaña y los hijos de los vezinos y naturales enbiandolos a los estudios despaña seria hazer grandes gastos y por falta de posibilidad algunos se quedaron ynorantes pedir y suplicar a su magestad tenga por bien e haga merced que en al monasterio de los domynycos desta ciudad aya estudio general con las preuilegios y esenciones y capitulaciones que tiene el estudio general de Salamanca." Entry of January 23, 1550, *Cabildos de Lima*, IV, 258.

¹² The original of this often cited document has been lost from the *Libro de cédulas* preserved in the archives of the university. A reproduction of the copy found in the *Archivo de Indias* is printed in Eguiguren, *San Marcos*, 265.

The delays of travel in those days prevented the arrival of the *cédula* in Lima until late in the following year. To herald its arrival, after the custom of the time, a reception was held on January 2, 1553, in the Chapter room of the Dominican house. There before the president of the Audiencia, the Archbishop of Lima, the assembled friars, and other distinguished guests, the document was read and formally acknowledged.¹³ The officials kissed the paper and placed it on their heads in recognition of the king's authority.

The decree granted the university the privileges, franchises and exemptions enjoyed by Salamanca.¹⁴ The *cédula* mentioned the monastery of Rosario as the proposed site of the school but there is some evidence for the belief that the royal document arrived in time to recognize an accomplished fact and that classes were already being held.¹⁵ Because of the lack of endowment, however, the new university had to struggle along on the meager aid provided by the Dominicans. Not until 1557 did any assistance come from the government. In that year the viceroy, Hurtado de Mendoza, Marqués de Cañete, provided a small subsidy of 400 pesos annually drawn from a *repartimiento* of Indians in Magdalena.¹⁶

Because of these slender resources the university was restricted to a fraction of its proper functions. The *studium generale*, according to the tradition of the European schools of that day, required that there be graduate studies in at least one of the areas of study, Theology, Law, Medicine, and Arts. Before 1570, how-

¹³ Eguiguren, *San Marcos*, 24-25, and *Alma Mater*, 97-99.

¹⁴ Except the exemption of the graduates from taxation. Cf. Bernabé Cobo, *Historia de la fundación de Lima*, Mexico, 1639, reproduced in M. González de la Rosa, ed., *Monografías históricas sobre la ciudad de Lima*, Lima, 1881, I, 211.

¹⁵ There is considerable difference of opinion as to when the first classes were held at Lima. The estimates run from the extreme and obviously erroneous position of Lanning who says 1576 to that of Eguiguren who says 1549 and supports his statement with considerable circumstantial evidence. The chroniclers, Cobo and Calancha, both say 1553, the year of the proclamation of the royal *cédula* in Lima. Cf. John Tate Lanning, *Academic Culture in the Spanish Colonies*, New York, 1940, 14; Cobo, *Historia de Lima*, op. cit., 2; Fray Antonio de la Calancha, *Historia de la universidad de San Marcos hasta el 15 de julio de 1647*, Barcelona, 1638, reprinted in Eguiguren, *Diccionario*, I, 3; Eguiguren, *San Marcos*, 22ff.

¹⁶ This was to endow a chair of Grammar (Latin) in the monastery. The order of Cañete is printed in Eguiguren, *Alma Mater*, 109. A default apparently caused Toledo in 1581 to order the *encomendero* to pay the amount due. Eguiguren, *Diccionario*, I, 952-3. I have found no justification for Zimmerman's statement that the school at this time had no funds, rooms or equipment. Cf. his *Toledo*, I, pt. 1, 240.

ever, Lima taught only Theology and Arts. The instruction was probably very elementary.¹⁷

Contemporary writers point to the rigid Dominican control as a cause of the slow development of the university. From the beginning the friars had combined the duties of prior of the monastery and rector of the university, and restricted the holding of that important post to one of their number. This arrangement gave to the university the aspect of a private school of the Dominican Order. Moreover, other religious were not permitted to occupy chairs, and only an occasional secular professor joined the faculty as the meager endowment permitted.¹⁸ Under such handicaps the school did not develop according to the great expectations of the *cédula* of 1551.

In time, opposition began to grow against the Dominican rule of the university. There was a strong feeling that it could not develop properly under such auspices. Some rector-priors were chosen principally for their piety, it was charged, and could not adequately fulfill their academic duties.¹⁹ Moreover, it did not seem to these critics that the *cédula* of foundation had given such exclusive proprietary rights as the Order was exercising. There was pressure to emancipate the faculty through a free election of the rector. One of the first to make formal protest was Jerónimo Loaysa, the archbishop of Lima, and himself a former Dominican. In August of 1564 he wrote to Philip II asking that a *studium generale* be established in Lima. He pointed out that in various convents of the city, courses of study were being conducted, but there was no endowment and they were struggling to survive. It is clear from his letter that the archbishop was ignoring the establishment of the Dominicans and was advocating a new start, preferably to be housed in his cathedral since he asked for the endowment of a lecturer on the sacraments for the *ecclesia mayor*.²⁰

The king replied to Loaysa in October, 1566, that he realized the need for a school, and that he had written to the president of

¹⁷ In March, 1562, Fray Domingo de Santo Tomás wrote to the king pointing out that Grammar, Logic, and Theology were being taught at Rosario and asking that he support the work with an endowment. Eguiguren, *Alma Mater*, 117-118.

¹⁸ Eguiguren, *San Marcos*, 39. To see how this arrangement contrasted with the prevailing organization of the *studia* in Europe cf. John A. Kemp, S.J., "The Character of the Medieval Universities," *Historical Bulletin*, XVIII, (November, 1939), 5ff.

¹⁹ In the rectorate of Fray Alonso Guerra, (1569-1571) the controversy was particularly heated.

²⁰ Archbishop Loaysa to the king, August 20, 1564, in Eguiguren *Diccionario*, II, 899.

the Audiencia of Lima, Lope García de Castro, asking for his opinion as to how such a project could be carried out and the probable cost. In his letter to his governor, the king spoke of the need of a university in Lima so that the growing numbers of sons, both Spanish and mestizo, might be educated. Many, he said, are inclined to the pursuit of letters and to study, some of them for the priesthood.²¹ He asked to be informed about the place and manner of foundation, what would be necessary to build and endow it, and other particulars.

At this point it seems that all parties were ignoring the foundation at Rosario. In January, 1566, the prior-rector of the university made a plea to the king to save the Dominican arrangement. He pointed out that the *studium generale* was functioning at Rosario but that this and the other monastic schools of the colony could not get along without financial help. He asked, therefore, that all monasteries with established schools be aided with grants.²²

It is clear, however, in the further correspondence between the king and the chief of the Audiencia that the Spanish authorities were thinking along other lines. García de Castro's letter of June 5, 1566, again ignored the Dominican school and advised that His Majesty should establish a university with complete faculties, including those of Canon Law and Medicine. He pointed out that this would afford a wider opportunity for training the colonists since not everybody could live like nobility. Some should become lawyers and others clerics.²³ In another letter, the governor was still more explicit. The proposed university should have two chairs of Law, two of Canons, two of Grammar, one of Medicine, and two of Theology. To finance all this, he suggested the allotment of 5000 pesos in revenue from a *repartimiento* of Indians.²⁴ By 1569, therefore, the monarch had in his hands the

²¹ King to Loayza, October 5, 1566, "Cedulario arzobispal de la arquidiócesis de Lima, 1533-1820," *Revista del Archivo Nacional*, (1925), III, 298. King to Audiencia, October 19, 1566, *Ibid.*, III, 300.

²² Rector Francisco de la Cruz to the king, January 25, 1566, in Eguiguren, *Alma Mater*, 159. From the practical side, the rector points out that money would be saved by not having to send friars back to Spain for studies.

²³ Manuel Vicente Villarán, *La Universidad de San Marcos de Lima, los Orígenes: 1548-1577*, Lima, 1938, 14.

²⁴ García de Castro to the king, December 20, 1567, Villarán, 14. A reply of Philip to the governor on February 16, 1567, in answer to various letters finally makes mention of the *studium* of the Dominicans, but the king is still seeking information about what faculties there are, what progress has been made, and if the people are inclined to study. This report "up to now you have not sent us, and because without it we do not know how to provide, it is necessary that you do so. Let us have it as soon as possible." Eguiguren, *Diccionario*, II, 900.

plan of a school to serve the needs of the colony. But whether there were to be two universities or one in Lima, or whether the Dominican foundation could be made to serve a broader purpose, were questions to be decided in the regime of the able man who directed the affairs of the colony for the next twelve years.

With the arrival of Francisco de Toledo in Lima in November, 1569, a new era began in the government of Peru.²⁵ As viceroy he was the supreme authority in the colony. Standing in the place of the king himself, he was governor and captain general, president of the *hacienda real*, with the right to exercise the ecclesiastical patronage. The only check upon him was the laws and directives written for him by the Court at Madrid, and the only appeal from his acts and judgments was to the king himself. As executor of the *patronato real* he had virtually complete administrative control over the Church in his territory.²⁶ Moreover, he brought with him to Lima the dread Inquisition which he could use against a recalcitrant clergy if they defended their ecclesiastical rights against absolutism in opposition to the *patronato*.²⁷ By invoking this broad authority he could control the university in virtue of the *patronato* and the royal decree of foundation.²⁸

Toledo was not the type of man to be satisfied with the mere semblance of power. On his arrival he immediately went to work to set up the lines of his authority.²⁹ With respect to the Church he was especially energetic. Although he was a religious man he would tolerate no interference or even non-cooperation with what he considered his own or the king's authority. He once wrote to Philip II that as far as the liberties of the friars and other clergy were concerned "it is truly evident to all your ministers that if there is any peril threatening the colony it is due to them." In the same letter he said that "... It is not to the best interests of Your

²⁵ For a description of Lima on Toledo's arrival see Levillier, *Toledo*, I, 100ff.

²⁶ For a description of the viceregal powers, cf. Tomás Zepeda Rincón, *La instrucción pública en la Nueva España en el siglo XVI*, Mexico, 1933, 16. The machinery of state control over the Church receives detailed treatment in Paul S. Lietz, "Vasco de Quiroga: Oidor Made Bishop," *Mid-America*, XXXII (January, 1950), 13ff. Toledo's authority extended to the appointment (presentation) of all priests except those going to the missions. Levillier, *Toledo*, I, pt. 1, 122.

²⁷ Toledo entered Lima accompanied by the first inquisitor, Serván de Cerezuela. Eguiguren, *Alma Mater*, 10. On his use of that body for political purposes, cf. *Ibid.*, 169.

²⁸ Even the monastery of Rosario itself had been made possible by a royal grant of land, and so came under the *patronato*. Maximilian to the Audiencia, October 25, 1549, Eguiguren, *Diccionario*, II, 1124.

²⁹ He left Lima on October 22, 1570, for a five year visitation of his diocese. Zimmerman, *Toledo*, 90, 221.

Majesty that either friars or secular clergy have either important authority or duties, for the good of the colony."³⁰

Obviously, such an important institution as a university would be an object of immediate concern to the watchful eye of the viceroy. It was not unlikely that he should place himself at the head of a movement to take the school away from the jurisdiction of a prior-rector who as head of a religious community would not be as amenable to secular control as Toledo would require.

Just before the viceroy's arrival, other important voices were added to those calling for a break-up of the Dominican monopoly of the university at Lima. The *ayuntamiento*, acting through its procurator at Court, asked the king for help to set up a *studium generale*.³¹ Again no mention was made of Rosario. It was not through forgetfulness. The king's answer again asked for particulars. There were the usual questions. Where should it be located? How much would it cost for support? There the matter stood when Toledo arrived, and it was clear that he carried with him full instructions on how to deal with the problem.³²

Nevertheless, the plans for a change in the administration of the school lagged. The impatient *ayuntamiento* in March, 1571, again pressed the king for action. The university should be in a large and convenient location where all the branches of the curriculum might be taught. There should be a subsidy. The king was reminded of the endowment granted to the University of Mexico which came with its charter in 1551.³³ The answer to the city council came back in a *cédula* of December 9, 1571, to the effect that His Majesty had given full instructions to Toledo on how to proceed. He suggests that the city officials spur him to action.³⁴ Unfortunately, a few months after the new viceroy

³⁰ Toledo to the king, October 15, 1578, Eguiguren, *Diccionario*, II, 928. For further discussion of his ideas on this subject, cf. Levillier, *Toledo*, I, pt. 1, 123-4. His antagonism against Church authority apparently extended to money matters. He tried at one time to get the king to "stop the flood of money which goes to Rome." Valcárcel, *Toledo*, 48.

³¹ King to Juan Cortés, the procurator, February 25, 1568, *Alma Mater*, 172-173.

³² Eguiguren, *Diccionario*, I, 59.

³³ Instructions to Miguel de Caydia, procurator of Lima, March 12, 1571. Calancha, *San Marcos*, in Eguiguren, *Diccionario*, I, 3.

³⁴ "Y así habemos ordenado á Don Francisco de Toledo . . . lo que se ha de hacer en lo tocante á la dicha Universidad de esa ciudad, acudireis á el y solicitarleis para que cumpla lo que le embiamos á mandar . . ." King to the *ayuntamiento* of Lima, December 9, 1571, in Eguiguren, *Diccionario*, II, 907.

arrived in the City of Kings, he began his long visitation of the viceroyalty, and there was further delay.³⁵

In the interval, the disagreement between the lay and clerical groups of the faculty reached new proportions. Some of the professors were graduates of Salamanca and felt strongly by reason of their own experience about the handicaps of Dominican rule. There was also an increasing number of graduates of Lima itself who belonged to the cloister, but were prevented from having a voice in the administration. It was these groups that finally decided to take their case to the Audiencia, which had been entrusted with the administration of affairs in the viceroy's absence. A committee appeared before the court which included Gaspar de Meneses, Marcos de Lucio, López Guarnido, and Cosme Carillo, all teachers, asking that a directive be issued them to call the full cloister together for the purpose of freely electing a rector. On May 11, 1571, that authorization was given.³⁶ Subsequently the cloister met and elected a layman, Dr. Pedro Fernández Valenzuela, who by strange coincidence was also a judge of the Audiencia.

The Dominicans did not take any part in the election. On July 3, the procurator general of the Order, Fray Diego de Corvalán, registered a formal protest before the court. He claimed that the friars had not been notified, that the whole thing had been done secretly, and rejected the election of the lay rector. He insisted that the whole procedure was illegal because the privileges, including the *rectorado*, had been permanently conceded to the Dominicans of Rosario by the *cédula* of foundation of 1551.³⁷

There is good reason to believe that Toledo was keeping in touch with university affairs during his absence and that he not only had a hand in the decision of the Audiencia but may have designated the man to be elected. Possibly the royal order of August 10, 1570, ordering a free election at Lima may have kept him from simply making an outright appointment.³⁸ The viceroy's guiding hand may be detected in the decision of the court, just two days after the procurator made his plea, that the election was valid and acclaiming the new rector.³⁹ In any event, Toledo's

³⁵ Toledo did not return to Lima till November 20, 1575. Zimmerman, *Toledo*, 221.

³⁶ Eguiguren, *San Marcos*, 44-5.

³⁷ The text of the protest is in Eguiguren, *Alma Mater*, 185.

³⁸ The order of August 10, 1570, appears modified to include the viceroy of Mexico, in *Recopilación de leyes de los reynos de las Indias*, Madrid, 1681, lib. I, tit. XXII, ley 4.

³⁹ The text of the decision of the Audiencia of May 13, 1571, appears in Eguiguren, *Alma Mater*, 187.

communications with the king during the controversy make clear his own position on the issues. Almost a month before the disputed election of May, 1571, he wrote that no universities should be established in monasteries and asked the royal sanction for the separation of the school of Lima. The king replied on December 30 that he agreed to have it that way.⁴⁰ Thus, by the end of the year 1571 the Dominicans had lost the battle, both in law and in fact, to a powerful combination of archbishop, faculty, city government, Audiencia, and viceroy. Through these rigorous measures the interested parties got their "free" election and the Dominicans lost their university. There was no longer any need to send petitions asking the king for a new foundation. By these means the historical continuity of the school was preserved.

The difficulties, however, had just begun. A most embarrassing obstacle presented itself to the functioning of the cloister. Since the government made no provision otherwise, it was necessary for the school to continue to use the facilities of the monastery of Rosario for its classes and degrees. When the Audiencia ordered the Dominicans to permit the use of their premises, they quite naturally objected. The provincial, Fray Alonso de la Cerda, was entirely consistent. He refused to accept the election as valid or give recognition to the decision of the Audiencia. Consequently, he saw no reason to admit a group, who indignantly insisted that they were the university, to the use of the Dominican properties.⁴¹

At this point began a long series of incidents between the indignant friars demanding their rights and the laymen equally insistent on the use of the monastery. There were recriminations and scenes which at this date make rather amusing reading, however undignified they may have appeared to contemporaries. In the litigation of the next few years between the two groups, witnesses testify that the friars on occasion locked the professors out of the university quarters, or threatened to eject them forcibly, interfered with examinations by ringing church bells, or sang in choir deliberately to drown out the proceedings.⁴²

The controversy could only be settled in one way, by finding a new site for the school. One possibility was the new Jesuit *colegio* just recently opened. The viceroy, seeking a way out of the Do-

⁴⁰ King to Toledo, December 30, 1571, in answer to Toledo's letter of March 25, 1571. Text is in Eguiguren, *Diccionario*, II, 908.

⁴¹ Eguiguren, *San Marcos*, 47.

⁴² Cf. the depositions of witnesses in Vargas Ugarte, *Manuscriptos Peruanos*, II, 197ff; Eguiguren, *Alma Mater*, 190ff; and Eguiguren, *Diccionario*, II, 17ff.

minican difficulties, suggested to the Jesuits that they offer the use of their quarters at San Pablo to house the university. They refused the offer, as might be expected, because it was clear that they would be required to play host in their house of studies to a school entirely out of their control.⁴³

With other possibilities apparently exhausted, the only recourse was to purchase a new site. On September 16, 1573, the *ayuntamiento* decided to investigate the price of a convent of the Augustinians, called San Marcelo. The university with the aid of loans finally bought the property and moved into its new quarters some time before the transaction was completed on December 22, 1574.⁴⁴ To match the new location a new name was chosen for the school. Previously it had been known as the University of Lima or of the City of Kings. With much ceremony, a name was selected by chance from a number of appropriate possibilities, and the school became San Marcos.⁴⁵

The *studium generale* under its new administration began a period of rapid development. It now began to grow along the lines of the plan and purpose expressed in the *cédula* of foundation by which it was to pattern itself on Salamanca, so often mentioned as its model and prototype. Teachers of other Orders could now occupy its chairs, and students could follow a more varied curriculum. Despite the bitterness which manifested itself at times in the conflict with the Dominicans, there was no attempt to exclude members of that Order from teaching positions. In subsequent years many illustrious Dominicans occupied the chairs of Theology in the university.⁴⁶

In furthering this program of expansion, Toledo made available the revenues of several *repartimientos* of Indians who by their labor furnished the university with some thirteen thousand pesos annually. From this handsome income the cloister was to endow

⁴³ Vargas Ugarte, *Manuscritos Peruanos*, II, 201; Oliva Anello, S.J., *Historia del Perú y varones insignes en santidad de la Compañía de Jesús*, Lima, 1895. This book was written in 1598. The Jesuits came to Lima on April 1, 1568, and they stayed with the Dominicans at Rosario until they could move into their Colegio San Pablo about a year later. Father Vargas Ugarte labels as false the much repeated statement that Toledo wanted to give the university to the Jesuits. The story has no substantiation in the correspondence of either the viceroy or members of the Order. Ruben Vargas Ugarte, S.J., *Los Jesuitas del Perú (1568-1767)*, Lima, 1941, 90.

⁴⁴ Eguiguren, *San Marcos*, 55. About two years later, the university moved again to a roomier site in San Juan de la Penitencia.

⁴⁵ The cloister met on December 22, 1574. Vargas Ugarte, *Manuscritos Peruanos*, II, 203.

⁴⁶ Eguiguren, *San Marcos*, 55-6, gives a list of the Dominicans.

seventeen chairs in the fields of Theology, Canon and Civil Law, Arts, and possibly Medicine.⁴⁷ With this move, the viceroy completed his plan for royal control of the San Marcos. In making the grant of revenues, he was careful to attach the reservation that his ordinances, provisions, and constitutions must be obeyed. In fact, his concern over his authority was such that he made the initial appointments of the faculty himself.⁴⁸

This policy of "total" control achieved by the viceroy is in patent contradiction to the exercise of any outside authority over San Marcos, including that of the Pope. Yet papal protection and a papal title had been secured for San Marcos by a bull issued at the request of the king in July, 1571.⁴⁹ By this charter, the school became a pontifical university. Its masters and doctors were admitted to the fellowship of the faculties of Europe with the right of *jus ubique docendi*, of teaching in all other papal institutions. Its decrees were given universal recognition, deriving their validity from the papal bull sent for that purpose.⁵⁰

Obviously the freedom which such papal protection gave a school from interference by royal or feudal authority in medieval times had long since been dissipated. In the face of the rising absolutism the Spanish universities, including Salamanca, were the first in Europe to feel the weight of the secular authority. The *Siete Partidas* of Alfonso the Wise contains a detailed set of decrees governing university affairs.⁵¹ The growth of the royal power had reached such proportions by the 16th century that there was little concern over interference by the pope. In reality, the papal title for San Marcos in the Spanish system meant accreditation by a

⁴⁷ Toledo to the king, April 15, 1577, informing him of the arrangement of the endowment. Classes were to start April 25, 1577, and Toledo would like the fact publicized. Text in Eguiguren, *Diccionario*, II, 923. Cobo, *Historia de Lima*, 220-1, gives a list of chairs.

⁴⁸ Cf. Eguiguren, *Diccionario*, II, 917, for the conditions attached to the grant of October 12, 1576; the proclamation of Toledo of May 24, 1577, places the university under the *patronato*. Cobo, *Historia de Lima*, 220-1. Toledo was to make the original appointments with the advice of learned men. Cf. certification of the secretary of the University, January 24, 1577, Eguiguren, *Diccionario*, II, 921.

⁴⁹ "Dilectus filius fratribus lectoribus. . ." Bull of Pius V issued July 25, 1571. Printed copy in *Libro de cédulas*, folio 1, in the archives of the university.

⁵⁰ For discussion of this point cf. Villarán, *San Marcos*, 3-4; Zepeda Rincon, *Instrucción pública*, 103; Kemp, "Medieval Universities," *loc cit.*

⁵¹ *Las siete partidas del rey don Alfonso el Sabio*, Madrid, 1807, part. II, tit. XXXI. Stephen D'Irsay, *Histoire des Universités Françaises et étrangères*, Paris, 1933, I, 143, states that this is the first example of state legislation being applied to universities.

comparatively feeble authority effectively dominated by local political interests.

Toledo, then, was acting on firm ground when he ordered a set of constitutions to be drawn up by the cloister and submitted to him for approval. The set of forty-two provisions received the viceregal sanction on October 11, 1570, and the university began an organized life under a formal charter from the state.⁵² The regulations covered all phases of university life, including the duties of officials, courses of study, requirements for graduation, and the elaborate ceremonial customary in those times. Within a limited area, the cloister was allowed freedom of action. In conformity with medieval tradition, the rector was elected by the cloister, and might even be a student. Chairs were also filled by election. It required a direct order from the king, however, to preserve the elections from the interference of the viceroy.⁵³ Toledo ultimately extended the area of autonomy to permit the rector his full power over students and faculty. This right, also a part of the medieval tradition, included questions of discipline involving criminal acts whether they had to do with studies or not, provided they were not crimes punishable by bloodletting, mutilation, or whipping. Crimes involving the latter were remanded to the royal courts.⁵⁴

While the granting of these powers seemed to be moving San Marcos toward the liberal medieval tradition, the facts do not bear this out. Toledo constantly intervened in the internal affairs of San Marcos. He decreed the type of dress to be worn by the students, legislated cleanliness about the grounds, created new teaching chairs, and—a far more serious matter—ordered the rector and the doctors to reverse themselves after they had failed a candidate, and required that the degree be granted.⁵⁵

Several terms are commonly used by the historians to describe Toledo's reformation of the university. Most frequently one is told that San Marcos was "emancipated," or "laicized," or "secular-

⁵² The text of these first constitutions is in Eguiguren, *Alma Mater*, 229ff. These served as the basis for the first printed set published in 1602.

⁵³ King to Viceroy Toledo, August 10, 1570, Eguiguren, *Alma Mater*, 183.

⁵⁴ Proclamation of Toledo, May 25, 1580. Text is in Eguiguren, *Diccionario*, II, 981-982. These provisions also appear in the *Recopilación de leyes*, lib. I, tit. XXII, ley XII.

⁵⁵ July 16, 1580, Toledo legislated on student dress. Eguiguren, *Diccionario*, II, 941-943; November 5, 1580, he ordered the grounds cleaned up; *Ibid.*, 949; April 25, 1581, he reversed the decision of the cloister, *Ibid.*, 954.

ized." Of these three, clearly the first is entirely inappropriate, and the last two must be considerably qualified for readers who live in the modern secular tradition of the state. There is no hint in all that Toledo did that he tried to separate religion from the curriculum of the university. The state, in fact, was pledged to maintain the medieval integration of religion with the course of study, since its legal and theoretical right to be in the Indies was predicated on its promise to preserve Catholicism and spread it. The clergy still taught at San Marcos, and the medieval curriculum remained intact during Toledo's day.

The viceroy's achievement, then, must be measured by other than substantive changes. His contribution was administrative. He cleared the way, at what cost we have seen, for the growth of San Marcos, but always on his own terms. The Jesuit Cobo, writing in 1619, gives the best estimate of Toledo's work and pronounces its most fulsome praise.⁵⁶ From the original seventeen chairs of Toledo's time the school had grown until there were now between eighty and ninety masters and doctors. There were about a thousand students. Only Medicine was missing from the curriculum.⁵⁷

The greatness of San Marcos, said Cobo, was attested by the numbers of learned men who had come out of it in recent years. Its graduates staffed the cathedrals, parishes and Indian missions. Where before these men had only religious orders, now they were masters and doctors as well. Instead of sending out friars from Spain to work in the missions—a great expense to the government—they were now provided for. What is more, the tribunals and Audiencias were staffed with graduates of the university. Speaking as an eye witness Cobo said that when he first came to the city of Lima in 1599, there were no native graduates teaching at San Marcos, in 1619 there was scarcely a rector elected who was not a Peruvian. This phenomenal growth Cobo attributes without reservation to the administrative genius of the viceroy Toledo.⁵⁸

PAUL S. LIETZ

Loyola University, Chicago

⁵⁶ Cobo, *Historia de Lima*, 226.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 228.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 228–229.

Book Reviews

Haven in the Woods. By John I. Kolehmainen and George W. Hill. Wisconsin Historical Society, Madison, 1951. Pp. ix, 177. \$2.50.

Although the hardy Finnish immigrants, after reaching our eastern ports, dispersed themselves all over the nation, they seemed especially attracted to Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. Perhaps the terrain and climate in the states mentioned reminded them of their homeland. Most of those who came, and the immigration really began in earnest only after our Civil War, were peasants, lumbermen, and migratory rural workers, although some urban, unskilled laborers also were among those leaving Finland. They brought with them a willingness to work hard, to save their money, and to mind their own business, all of which were qualities destined to enrich the land of their adoption.

Finland herself was wise enough to realize that she was poorer with the departure of each emigrant ship. The editors in their papers and the ministers in their pulpits were urging the prospective emigrants, by 1890, to remain in Finland. The Finns were told that they were betraying their fatherland by leaving it, and were assured that Finland needed the labor of every son and daughter. Such preachings, however, whether printed or oral, fell on indifferent ears, or upon ears already attuned to the clink of coins used in payment of higher wages in the United States. Moreover, some Finns left because of the threat of military service in the Russian armies, and also because of the limited franchise and the severe restrictions upon freedom of speech and of assembly, measures decreed by Russian influence, an evil force that lasted until 1917.

By 1940 it was estimated by the authors that only one-fourth of the foreign-born Finns in Wisconsin could be classified as urban, although practically all of them had started life in America by working in logging camps, in quarries, in mines, at the docks, or in fishing fleets. However, the Finns found these jobs hazardous, especially the jobs in the mines of fifty years ago. In 1900, a mine disaster in Utah took the lives of sixty-three Finns; in 1903, at Hanna, Wyoming, ninety-six Finns were killed in a mine accident. In the period from 1900 to 1903, 146 Finns were killed in accidents in mines in Michigan. Many other Finns died from miner's consumption, or silicosis.

In desperation, so to say, the surviving Finns began a "back to the land" movement, rather than to permit even the remainder to be sacrificed to American industrial needs. Cut over land was purchased by the Finns in various parts of Michigan and Wisconsin. It was poor land, but it was cheap and all that they could afford. From three to five hundred dollars often bought 160 acres of land, in the period 1903-1905. By 1910 the Finns in northern Wisconsin were forced to pay from five to ten dollars per acre, but the land could be paid for over an extended period. The land was poor and life was hard on the northern Wisconsin farms. Schools were inadequate; the sons and daughters of the immigrants were inclined to leave their home surroundings as soon as possible.

Other unfortunate characteristics of the Finnish settlements were their indifference to religion and their sympathy for socialism. It is estimated by the authors that at least two-thirds of the Finns in this country have been indifferent to religion since 1900. Lutheranism has lost its appeal to such a degree that some have become definitely anti-religious. The reasons for this attitude, as well as the reasons why socialism has seemed so attractive, are discussed unemotionally by the authors. The experiences of the Finns with cooperatives of various kinds are presented in some detail. The Finns are fortunate in having had such sympathetic but at the same time objective writers to recount the interesting story of the men and women who sought a haven in the woods in the northern section of our nation.

PAUL KINIERY

Loyola University, Chicago

Cinderella of Europe. By Sheila M. O'Callaghan. Philosophical Library, New York, 1951. Pp. 200. \$3.75.

Our American opinion, under pressure of military concern, seems to be groping toward an insight into contemporary Spain. It is a commonplace among our political scientists that there is a vast amount of material ready on this subject, but no one has found the way to mobilize it. Historians, who notably rest their cases on past ideas as well as past events, continue to edit texts and monographs in the spirit of '61. Here, now, from England comes a really progressive study of the burning topic. Disregarding Shakespeare's advice: "Beware of entrance to a quarrel"—if you want a scholar to read your book—the lady Oxonian brings a thorough experience and a mordant wit into combat for revision of her country's official attitude toward the land of Cinderella.

Hers is a hardy campaign. Though we know fairy tales are true, we act as if we disbelieve them. Cinderella made it. Her magic slippers and comely countenance quite took off the Prince. In real life, a Civil War with 1,200,000 officially admitted casualties, a young man named José Primo de Rivera, and a badly stung populace, conspired to create a new kind of state in Spain. Its motto runs: "Intolerable that great masses of people live miserably while the few enjoy every luxury." Its ruler maintains that of all the nations only Spain and Russia know where they are heading. Its people say: "We are all in this together." It asks recognition.

Mr. Atlee upholds the pretense that can recognize "Red" China without approving its redness yet scorn "Black" Spain because of its blackness, in spite of what Churchill called its claims on British gratitude. This takes the breath of people who have a standard of truth in historical and any other investigation. Our own American Historical Association—in its second-last Chicago convention—endured bitter pangs of debate, what time a batch of self-styled anti-Fascists put forth mighty effort to elect a president entirely untouched by State Department contact with the villain. Karl Stern in his *Pillar of Fire* offers a cue to it all: "Hate like love knows

no argument." But research does not proceed by rule of love or hate. Its devotees will relish the fairy tale.

After a perhaps necessary bombardment of Downing Street, the narrative explores the overthrow of Alfonso XIII and its symptomatic reflection of nineteenth century Spain republicanism. As one of their intellectuals admitted: "We ape the politics of all other countries." Another explained, in the tradition of dialectical materialism: "We have no country." All this, while pseudo-democracy brought a plethora of politics, a stagnation of government, and not-exceptional success in assassinating opposition characters. The fratricide of 1936-1939 is passed over in silence, mirroring the wish of Spain today to forget its horror.

By far the best part of the book lies in chapters six through nine. There one finds a really penetrating account of the political, economic and social ways in the new, youthful people. To read it one must be prepared for surprises, for understanding of viewpoints and institutions proper not to American but to Spanish psychology. They need political order; we have it. They do not give equal pay for equal work, nor level downward but upward. They trust no parties, nor brain-trusts, nor a one-party state. In their recent memory is Indalecio Prieto's ringing challenge of 1936: "If the Right triumphs, there *must* be civil war, and *they* will be wiped out." The authoress interjects the 1950 election manifesto of Atlee's group: "In no circumstances must the Tories be allowed to get a parliamentary majority; . . . [they must be] smashed beyond recovery." Spaniards have long recollection and relish no recurrence of this kind of thing.

Americans will wonder at the tax figures. Only thirty-five Spaniards pay the maximum rate of 46% on incomes over one million pesetas (about \$60,000) annually, and income tax begins at 60,000 pesetas (about \$3,600)! Where do all the funds for welfare arise? Directly from business profits. The details in this, as in the method of choosing the national assembly, are complex and defy honest translation into our ready idioms. Voluntary association contributes what compulsive law attempts in England and the U. S. A.

Ostracism from world trade put much of the drag on their production. Theft of their (fourth largest) gold deposit in 1938 left the treasury in dire straits. Transport still worries along on 1924 models. Yet their money buys twice what English brings.

Lest one imagine this book to be but eulogy, abundant criticism is found for many Spanish doings, from articles in the Falangist creed to military privilege in civil life. The work exhibits the best in Oxford independence of thought and penetrating analysis. A fair index assists the reader, though the printing and general format reflect economic stringency.

W. EUGENE SHIELS, S.J.

Xavier University, Ohio

Notes and Comments

The University of California Publications in History, Volume 40 and Volume 41, 1951, are now obtainable from the University of California Press. These two scholarly works are: *The Georgia-Florida Frontier, 1793-1796, Spanish Reaction to French Intrigue and American Designs*, by Richard K. Murdoch, and *The Establishment of Canadian Diplomatic Status at Washington*, by John S. Galbraith. The first named volume of 208 pages, including the bibliography and index, answers the question: What did Spain through its agents at St. Augustine and Havana do "to drive the invaders from East Florida and to frustrate attempts at internal revolts?" The second work in 119 pages examines the rise of Canada from a colonial to national status and the establishment of a Canadian foreign policy distinct from the empire policy. The achievement of an international status meant the exchange of diplomatic representation with the United States.

* * * *

David Rankin Barbee has a very interesting article in the *Maryland Historical Magazine*, June, 1951. He entitles it "Lincoln, Chase, and the Rev. Dr. Richard Fuller." The contrast between the unswerving attitude toward secession of Lincoln, the politician's position of playing both sides as taken by Secretary Chase, and that of the anti-slavery, Southern Baptist leader is made from sound source materials. Fuller's opinion of Lincoln's constitutional stand gradually changed with comprehension of the full import of secession. The article closes with a touching scene that occurred when Fuller met again 150 emancipated Negroes to whom he had once been owner and pastor.

Another sidelight on Lincoln appears in *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society*, Summer, 1951. Harlan Hoyt Horner writes "Lincoln Rebukes a Senator." Orville Hickman Browning was the object of the scolding, and A. Lincoln's letter of reprimand appears toward the end of the article.

* * * *

Michigan History, June, 1951, is Detroit's 250th birthday festival number. The calendar of events from July 4 to October 21 is printed. In the list we find an historical spectacle, "City of

INDEX

MID-AMERICA

VOLUME XXXIII

INDEXER'S NOTE

Names of the contributors are in small capitals; titles of articles in this volume are in quotation marks; titles of books and periodicals reviewed or mentioned are in italics. Book reviews are entered under author and title of book, and under the name of the reviewer; no entries are made for subject of the book except in the case of biographies. The following abbreviations are used: tr., translator; ed., editor; revs., reviews; revd., reviewed.

- Acadia, 33-34
 Acosta, Fr. José de, 152, 156
 Adams Express Co., 74
 Aiton, Arthur S., *Rise of Latin American Nations*, noted, 61-62
America's Second Crusade, by W. H. Chamberlain, revd., 57-59
America, steamboat, 72
 Andujar, Fr. Francisco de, 106, 165-166
 Angostura, 218-220
Annals of Iowa, contents noted, 133
 Araure, Battle of, 120-121
 Armstrong, H. F., *Tito and Goliath*, revd., 129-130
Athenaeum, 227
 Augustinian Friars, 251
 Ausubel H., *Historians and their Craft* revd., 128-129
- Bank of Venezuela, 208
 Barclay, Rev. Patrick, writings of, 140-141, 145
 Basaldúa, Fr. Juan M., 43
 Bartille, Cadillac in, 29-30
 BAUR, JOHN E., "Venezuelan Education during Liberation," 103-127
 Beauty and Booty, 238-241
 Beers, William, 237
 Bégon, M., 34-35
 Bello, Andrés, 165-166, 177
 Bianchi, pirate, 206
 Bienville, 23, 26-28, 37
 Billy the Kid, 68
 Blackburn, Dr. T. F., 76
 Bogotá, Santa fe de, 104, 106, 209-214, see also New Granada
 Bolívar, Simón, 105, 106, 119, 120, 125, 126, 158-187, 203-224
 BOOK REVIEWS, 56-67, 128-130, 188-194, 256-259
- Boves, Gen. José Tomás, 186, 206, 207
 Bowen, Emanuel, writings of, 149, 154-156
 BRIGGS, HAROLD E., "Lawlessness in Cairo, Illinois, 1848-1858," 67-88; *Frontiers of the Northwest*, noted, 132
 BROWN, THOMAS N., revs. F. E. Gibson, *The Attitudes of the New York Irish toward State and National Affairs*, 188-189
 Burke, Edmund, writings of, 149
- "Cadillac's Last Years," by JEAN DELANGLEZ, 3-39
 Cadillac, Bibliography on, 39-43
 Cairo, Illinois, lawlessness in, 67-88; *Cairo City Times*, 69-70; *City Trust Co.*, 69; *Court of Common Pleas*, 73, 84-85; *Cairo Delta*, 69, 70, 82, 87; *Cairo Sun*, 69, 80, 81; *Weekly Delta*, 71, 87;; *Weekly Times and Delta*, 73-76, 83-87
 Calabozo, 220
 California, Lower, 43-55; map of, 46; Report on, 47-55
 California, Univ. of, Publications, 259
 Campbell, Doctor John, writings of, 147, 148
 Campins, Don Lorenzo, 109
 Canada, see New France, Cadillac
 Capuchin Friars, and Bolívar, 216-219
 Caracas, Venezuela, 103-127, 161, 164, 165, 171, 172, 176-187, 203-224
 Carhuachi, 216-219
 Cartagena, 183, 209-211
 Carúpano, 207, 215
 Castillo, Gen., 210

- Castro, Lope García de, 247
 Chamberlain, Wm. H., *America's Second Crusade*, revd., 57
 Chandler, Zachariah, 98
 Cherokee Indians, 27
Chicago History, 260
 Churchill, Awnsham and John, writings of, 142-144, 148, 151
Cinderella of Europe, revd., 257
 Cleven, Prof. N. A. N., 159
 Climbing boys, 225-242
 Cobo, Fr. Bernabé, 255
 Coll y Prat, Archbishop Narciso, 185-186, 204-205
 Colombia, see New Granada, Bolívar
 Cooke, Capt. Edward, writings of, 144-145
 Corvalán, Fr. Diego de, 250
 Council of the Marine, 28-30
 Crozat, Antoine, 20-31, 36-37
 Cullen, Dr. Wm., 109-110
 Cumaná, Venez., 103, 105, 206
 Cundinamarca, 209-213; and see Bogotá
 Curaçao, 182
 Curtis, Robert R., cited, 69-70
 Cuzco, 244
- Dalrymple, Alexander, writings of, 156-157
 d'Argenteuil, Sieur, 8, 10
 Dart, Henry P., 36-37
 Dauphine Island, 23
 Dauxion-Lavaysse, J. F., 104-105, 107-108
 Defoe, Daniel, 145
 Deism, of Bolívar, 174-175
 De la Mothe, see Cadillac
 DELANGLEZ, JEAN, "Cadillac's Last Years," 3-39
Democracy and World Tensions, R. McKeon and S. Rokken, noted, 132
 Democratic Party in Louisiana, 1871, 89-102
 Deniaux, Fr. Chérubin, 15-16
 Depons, F. R. J., 110
 Detroit, Cadillac and, 3-19, 31-35
 Dominican Friars, 244-252
 Duane, Col. Wm., 117-118
 Dubuisson, Charles Renaud, Sieur, 4-12, 15, 18, 20, 38
 Duckett, Eleanor S., *Alcuin, Friend of Charlemagne*, revd., 191
 Duclos, Jean Baptiste, 23-28, 37, 39
 DUNNE, PETER MASTEN, "Report on Mission Santa Rosalia," 43-55
- Echeverría, Fr. José de, 44-45, 47
 Edwards, Governor of Illinois, 68
 Education in Venezuela, 1811-1819, 103-127
Education of the Mexican Nation, by G. K. Kneller, revd., 195
- Eguiguren, Luis A., 243, 244
 Election of 1876, presidential, 89-102
 Estes, Matthew, 236-241
- Ferdinand VII, 177, 203, 220, 221
 Flory, C. R., 226, 238
 France, Cadillac in, 19-23, 28-39
 Freemasons, 174, 222-224
 Frégault, Guy, 62
Frontiers of the Northwest, H. E. Briggs, noted, 132
 Frost, J. A., *Life on the Upper Susquehanna*, noted, 135-136
- Gaceta de Caracas*, 107, 124
 Gaines, F. P., 225-226, 237
 Gibson, Florence E., *Attitude of the New York Irish*, revd., 188
 Giradot, incident of, 204-205
 Gosting, G., *Travels*, cited, 151
 Grant, U. S., policy in Louisiana, 89-102
 Great Britain, and Bolívar, 177-178
 Greenlee, Wm. B., collection of, 198
 Grisanti, Angel, 108, 115
 Groulx, Canon Lionel, 62
 Guayana (Guiana), 215-220
- Haiti, 214-216
 Hakluyt, Richard, 140, 150
 Hall, Francis, cited, 127
 Harris, Rev. John, writings, 141, 148-149
Haven in the Woods, revd., 256
 Hayes, Rutherford B., disputed election, 89-102
 Hewitt, Abram S., 91, 98, 101
 Hickock, Wild Bill, 68
Historians and their Craft, H. Ausubel, revd., 128-129
 Holbrook, S. H., *The Yankee Exodus*, revd., 59-60
 Howard Memorial Library, 236, 237
 Huron Indians, 3
 Huntington Library, 236
 Hyslop, Maxwell, 215
- Illinois Central Railroad, 69, 70, 72
 Illinois Indians, 22, 26-27; Territory, 68
Indiana History, 260
 Institute of Latin American Studies, Univ. of Texas, 62
In the Service of Truth, noted, 63
 Iroquois Indians, 3
- JACOBSEN, JEROME V., "The Religion of Bolívar," 158-187, 203-224; revs. G. Woodbridge, *UNRRA*, 56-57; revs. F. A. Knapp, *Life of Sebastián Lerdo de Tejada*, 189-190; ed. Notes and Comments
 Jamaica, 213-214

- James, Jesse, 68
 James Sprunt Studies, noted, 63
Jesuit Beginnings in New Mexico, by Sr. Lilliana Owens, noted, 63
 Jesuits, (Society of Jesus), 3, 21, 22, 38, 104, 111, 251, 252; in Baja, California, 43-55; writers used by British authors, 50, 157
Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society, contents noted, 199
 Juan, George, and Don Antonio de Ulloa, *Relación* cited, 149-150
 Jurado, Juan, 210-211
 Kellogg, William P., 81, 92
 KEMP, JOHN A., revs. E. S. Duckett, *Alcuin*, 191-192
 Kentucky, 77, 78
 KINIERY, PAUL, revs., H. Ausubel, *Historians and their Craft*, 128-129; revs., Kolehmainen and Hill, *Haven in the Woods*, 256-257
 Kino, Fr. Eusebio, 155, 156
 Knapp, F. A., *Life of Lerdo*, revd., 189-190
 Kneller, George K., *The Education of the Mexican Nation*, revd., 195-196
 Kohn, J. H., cited, 150
 Laforest, François Daupin, Sieur de, 5-19, 20, 31, 33, 38
 Lamberville, Fr. de, 21
 Lancaster, Joseph, 122, 126
 Laval, Bishop, 21
 "Lawlessness in Cairo, Illinois, 1848-1858," by HAROLD E. BRIGGS, 67-88
 Lawyers, College of, in Caracas, 109, 119
 Lecuna, Vicente, 217
 Leonard, Irving, 243
 Leo XII, Pope, 221, 222
 L'Espinay, Governor of Louisiana, 27-28
 Leturia, Pedro, 159, 221
 Lewis Cass, by F. B. Woodford, revd., 193
 Library of Congress, 236, 237, 241
 LIETZ, PAUL S., "Viceroy Toledo and the University of San Marcos," 242-255
Life of Sebastián Lerdo, by F. A. Knapp, revd., 189
 Lima, Peru, 242-255
 L'Institut d'Histoire de l'Amérique française, 62
 Loaysa, Archbishop Jerónimo, 246, 247
 Locke, John, 106
 Lockman, *Travels of the Jesuits*, cited, 150-151
 Loreto Mission, Calif., 43-47
 Los Cayos, 215
 Louis XIV, 4, 5, 9, 10, 13, 14, 22, 23, 28
 Louis XV, 34-35
 Louisiana, Cadillac in, 3-9, 11, 15, 19-39; in 1876, 89-102
Louisiana Historical Quarterly, noted, 198-199
 Luyando, Fr. Juan B., 43-55; "Report of," 47-55
 Madrid, Bolívar in, 170-176
 Maracaibo, 103, 104, 122
 Marest, Fr. G., 18
 Margarita Isle, 187, 215
 Marygrove College, Detroit, 63
Maryland Historical Magazine, 259
 McCabe, Fr. Patrick, 74-75
 McEnery, John, 91, 92, 100
 McKeon, R., and S. Rokken, *Democracy and World Tensions*, noted, 132
 McVoy, C. L., *Bibliography of Fiction*, 237
 Mendoza, Hurtado de, 245
 Meneval, Gov., 37, 39
 Mérida, Venezuela, 103-105, 115-116
 Metford, J. C. J., *San Martin*, noted, 131
 Mexico, Univ. of, 243, 249
 Miami Indians, 3
Michigan History, noted, 200, 259
 Miranda, Francisco de, 106, 107, 113, 118, 126, 175-183, 187, 206, 215
Missions Studies, noted, 64
 Mississippi R., 68, 71, 88
 Mobile, Ala., 21-28
 Mollien, M. de, 165, 169, 171
Montana Magazine of History, noted, 135
 Monte Aventino, 175
 Monteverde, Gen., 179-183
 Montreal, 3, 4, 8, 11-15, 34
 Mulegé, see Santa Rosalia
 MULLER, HERMAN, "Trade Interests of XVIII Century British Travel Writers," 139-157
 Napoleon, and Bolívar, 171, 174, 175, 179, 185, 203, 205, 206, 211
 Narbrough, Sir John, writings, 144
 Navigation, river boat, 68-71, 88
 Newberry Library, 198
 New France, 3-19
 New Granada, 104-107, 183-187, 209-224
 New Mexico, 26
 New Orleans, *Republican*, 92
New Orleans Times, 94
New York Post, 101
 NOTES AND COMMENTS, 61, 131, 195, 259

- Ohio R., 68, 71, 88
Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly, noted, 134, 199
 O'Leary, Daniel F., 163, 174, 175
 Orinoco R., 214-220
 Osborne, Thomas, writings, 144
 Ottawa Indians, 3
 Ovalle, Fr. Alonso de, 151-152, 154
 Owens, Sr. Lilliana, *Jesuit Beginnings in New Mexico*, noted, 63

Pacific Historical Review, noted, 200
 Padilla, Admiral, 223
 Paducah, Ky., 83
 Paez, José A., 215, 219, 220
 Palacios, Esteban, 162-164, 170
 Palacios y Sojo, Fr. Pedro, 105, 163-164, 170, 171, 177
Palimpsest, The, noted, 133
 Palmer, Gov. John M., 92, 93, 95-97
 Paris, Bolívar in, 171-175
 Pensacola, 24-25
 Pereyra, Carlos, 159
 Peru, 242-255
 Phillips, Erasmus, writings, 142
 PHILLIPS, GEORGE L., "Tit for Tat: A Novel of Social Criticism," 225-241
 Piar, Manuel de, 206, 215-217
 Picolo, Fr. Francisco M., 43-44
 Pius VII, 174, 175
 Plummer, Henry, 68
 Pontchartrain, Fort, see Detroit
 Pontchartrain, Jérôme Phélypeau, Comte de, 3-12, 19-24, 38
 Puerto Cabello, 180, 183

 Quebec, 3-5, 8, 12, 15, 19, 20, 34

 Raudot, Antoine-Denis, 4, 11-13, 20, 24, 38
 Recollect, missionaries, 33
 "Religion of Bolívar," 158-187, 203-224
 "Report on Mission Santa Rosalia," 43-55
 Republican Party in Louisiana, 1876, 89-102
Revista Interamericana de Bibliografía, noted, 134
 Ribas, Gen. José Felix, 120, 206
 Robertson, Wm. S., 159, 176
 Rodríguez, Simón, 106, 125, 165-169, 174, 175
 Rogers, Capt. Woodes, 53-154
 Rojas, Aristides, 107
 Rokken, Stein, and R. McKeon, *Democracy and World Tensions*, noted, 132
 Roscio, Juan Germán, 109, 113, 118, 124
 ROSKE, RALPH J., "Visiting Statesmen in Louisiana, 1876," 89-102

 ROUBIK, JOSEPH, revs. H. F. Armstrong, *Tito and Goliath*, 129
 Rousseau, J. J., influence on Bolívar, 169-170
 Roy, Pierre, 15, 34

 Sabin, John *Dictionary of Books*, 237-238
 Salamanca, Univ. of, 244, 245, 250, 253
 San Bartolomé College, Bogotá, 104, 116
 Sanders, A. H., editor, 87; see Cairo, Ill.
 San Ignacio Mission, 44, 50
 San Marcos, Univ. of, 242-255
 San Martin, by J. C. J. Metford, revd., 131
 Santa Marta, 183, 209-213, 224
 Santander, Francisco de Paula, 165, 166, 171, 221, 223
 Santa Rosa College, Caracas, 104, 107-108, 117-121
 Santa Rosalia Mission, 43-55
 Sanz (Saenz), José Miguel, 106, 110-114, 124, 163
 Shaftesburg, Lord, 228-229
 Sherman, John, 92-102
 SHIELDS, W. E., revs. W. H. Chamberlain's *America's Second Crusade*, 57; revs. A. S. Aiton's, *Rise of Latin American Nations*, 61
 Sistiaga, Fr. Sebastián, 43-44
 Smith, Dr. D. T., 76
 Society of Jesus, see Jesuits
 Sojo, see Palacios y Sojo
South Atlantic Quarterly, noted, 134
South Carolina Goes to War, noted, 63
 South Dakota Historical Society, noted, 64
Southwestern Historical Quarterly, noted, 199
 Southwood, Marion, 225-242, esp., 237-241
 Spain, education in, 108, 123; Bolívar in, 170-179
 Stevens, John, writings, 141
 St. Louis, Mo., 70, 72
 Stowe, Harriet B., 225-229, 236, 241
 Sweeps, see Climbing boys

 Tamariz, Dr. Felipe, 109-110
 Techo, Fr. Nicolás del, 152
 Tennessee, 76
 Thebes, Illinois, 76, 82
The Newberry Library Bulletin, noted, 198
The Yankee Exodus, revd., 59
The Wi-iyohi, noted, 64
 Thompson, D. F., *Bibliography*, 237

- Tilden, Samuel J., policy in Louisiana, 89-102
 Tinedo, Fr. José A., 111
"Tit for Tat": A Novel of Social Criticism, by GEORGE L. PHILLIPS, 225-241
Tito and Goliath, revd., 129
 Toledo, Viceroy of Peru, Francisco de, 242-255
 Tonti, Alfonse, 31, 35
 Toro, Teresa, 171-173
 Totty, story of, 230-234
"Trade Interests of XVIII Century British Travel Writers," by HERMAN MULLER, 139-157
 Travel, writers on, 139-157
 Trumbull, Lyman, 92, 94-97, 101
 Tunja, 210
 Ulloa, Don Antonio de, 149-150
Uncle Tom's Cabin, 225-227
 University of Caracas, see Santa Rosa College
 University of Missouri Studies, noted, 132
 UNRRA, revd., 56
 Urdaneta, Luis, 210, 223
 Ustáriz, Luis and Francisco, 106, 113
 Ustáriz, Marqués de, 170-172
 Valenzuela, Dr. Pedro Fernández, 250
 Vargas Ugarte, Ruben, 244
 Vaudreuil, Louis Phillipe de Rigaud, Marquis de, 4, 7-15, 20, 33, 34
 Venezuela, 103-127, 161-187, 203-224
"Venezuelan Education during Liberation," by JOHN E. BAUR, 103-127
Verbum, noted, 200
"Viceroy Toledo and University of San Marcos," by PAUL S. LIETZ, 242-255
 Villapiente, Marqués de, 45
 Villars, Madame Dervieu du, 173, 174, 176
"Visiting Statesmen in Louisiana, 1876," ROSKE, RALPH J., 89-102
 Von Humboldt, Baron Alexander, 105, 106, 112, 165, 175
 Watters, Mary, 159, 221
 Watterson, Henry, 95, 98
West Virginia History, noted, 133
 Wicki, J., *Le Père Jean Leunis, S.J.*, revd., 197-198
William and Mary Quarterly, noted, 135
 WILLIAMS, MENTOR L., revs. F. B. Woodford's *Lewis Cass*, 193
Wisconsin Magazine of History, noted, 64
 Woodbridge, George, and staff, UNRRA, revd., 56
 Work, Munroe, *Bibliography of the Negro*, 237



UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN
NOV 1 1

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

B4



OCTOBER
1951

VOLUME 33

NEW SERIES, VOLUME 22

NUMBER 4

PUBLISHED BY LOYOLA UNIVERSITY
CHICAGO 26, ILLINOIS